BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Gift of the Author

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

ISAIAH'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

by
Charles Buchanan Copher

(A. B., Clark College, Atlanta, 1938; B. D., Gammon Theological Seminary, 1939; B. D., Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, 1941)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

1947

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

PhD
1947
co
copy 1

APPROVED

by

First Reader Elmer A. Leslie

Professor of Hebrew and O.T. Literature

Second Reader Robert H. Pfeiffer

Professor of Literature of the Old Testament

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
INTRODUCTION		
	Purpose and scope of the dissertation	i
	Definition of terms	ii
	Reasons for the investigation	iii
	The need for this study	iii
	History of literature on the subject	iv
	Method of approach	ix
I.	A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE SOURCES	1
	Pro-Assyrian or anti-Judean oracles	5
	Anti-Assyrian oracles	13
	Messianic and related oracles	47
	Summary of critical opinion	56
	The anti-Judean-Jerusalem oracles	57
	The anti-Assyrian oracles	58
	The Messianic and related oracles	60
	Conclusions	61
	The dating of the anti-Judean oracles . . .	61
	The authenticity and date of the anti-Assyrian oracles	63
	The Messianic and related oracles	73
	The Messianic oracles	74

CHAPTER PAGE

The future of the remnant 76

The remnant 77

The future 79

Summary Statement 81

Conclusion 84

II. HISTORY OF THE TIMES OF ISAIAH 86

Initial contacts between Assyria and the Hebrew kingdoms 87

Economic prosperity and exploitation . . . 88

Religious conditions 90

The Reawakening of Assyria 92

The Syro-Ephraimitic War 94

From the Syro-Ephraimitic War to the fall of Israel 95

From the fall of Israel to 705 97

The rebellion of 711 98

From 711 to 705 99

The rebellion of 705-701 99

Religious reform under Hezekiah 100

The collapse of the revolt 101

III. ISAIAH IN RELATION TO THE HISTORY OF HIS TIMES. 103

From 740 to the end of the Syro-Ephraimitic War 103

CHAPTER PAGE

From the Syro-Ephraimitic War to the collapse of Israel 108

From the annihilation of Israel to the beginning of Sennacherib's reign 110

The crisis of 720 110

The crisis of 713-711 111

The crisis of 705-701 112

Conclusion 118

IV. THE NATURE, STATEMENT, AND EXPOSITION OF ISAIAH'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY 120

The nature of Isaiah's philosophy 120

Isaiah's view of Yahweh in relation to events and the nations is limited to his own immediate generation 121

Isaiah's philosophy of history advances from general to specific considerations . 122

Isaiah's philosophy of history is limited in its immediate concern to Judah . . . 124

Isaiah's philosophy stated 125

Exposition of Isaiah's philosophy of history. 126

Yahweh, the Hebrew national god, is sovereign of the whole earth 126

CHAPTER PAGE

Yahweh has a twofold purpose, which includes the destruction of evil and the preservation of good 127

Yahweh's holiness in contrast to an evil earth 127

A remnant to be preserved 128

Yahweh is employing the Assyrians to effect his purpose 129

Yahweh is interested in, and controls the events of history 130

Yahweh's concern is limited to his own worshipers 130

Yahweh's concern is limited to Judah, and the remnant 131

Yahweh alone can save 132

V. EVALUATION OF ISAIAH'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY .

Strong points 133

Isaiah's philosophy of history gives to Yahweh the preeminent place in the life of the nation, and in the lives of those who either make up the nation or may survive the collapse of the nation 134

CHAPTER PAGE

Isaiah's philosophy of history attributes a purpose to history, which purpose is sure of realization, because Yahweh stands back of it 136

Isaiah's philosophy of history declares that Yahweh is punishing the wicked Judeans for their moral and religious impurity 137

Limitations 137

Isaiah's philosophy of history is limited in its outreach as concerns peoples other than the Hebrews, and ultimately, other than the remnant.. 138

Isaiah's philosophy of history encourages the concept of Yahweh as being merely a national god 138

It numbs the consciousness of national sins 139

The future is linked to a particular national entity 140

Isaiah's philosophy is not altogether in harmony with human experience 140

It leaves no place for the use of force in human relations 141

It encourages a passive trust in Yahweh . 142

CHAPTER PAGE

It gives rise to a misleading kind of religious security 142

It implies that evil always comes to a more or less speedy end 142

Isaiah's philosophy of history limits the kingdom of Yahweh (God) to the earth . . 143

Abiding values 144

The preeminence of the spiritual is an eternal truth 145

The proper course to survival is God-wards 145

A stabilizing message of hope, comfort, and security is found in the prophet's philosophy of history 146

The religion of Jesus is approximated in some respects 148

VI. CONCLUSION 150

Summary 150

Statement of contributions 154

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS 157

INTRODUCTION

I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE DISSERTATION

For many years it has been customary in certain circles of biblical interpreters to speak of Isaiah ben Amoz as having set forth either the beginnings of, or a complete philosophy of history. The purpose of this dissertation is to make an investigation of that portion of the book of Isaiah, ascribed to Isaiah ben Amoz, together with pertinent passages in the book of II Kings, in order to ascertain this philosophy, and to set it forth for any bearing it might have had on the prophet's own times, and might have for the present day. The sections to be studied are the first thirty-nine chapters, in the main, of the book of Isaiah, and II Kings, chapter 19.

Although Isaiah's sphere of interest included many nations: Assyria, Edom, Egypt, Ethiopia, Israel, Judah, Moab, Philistia, Phoenicia, to name a few, his views can be seen most clearly in his dealing with Assyria in relationship to Judah, if not also in the Messianic oracles. The particular sections of the book of Isaiah pertinent to this discussion, then, are those that contain the so-called Assyrian oracles, the Isaiah narratives in II Kings, and the oracles that picture a Messianic Age.

The number of oracles considered Assyrian as well as Messianic, differs according to students and their particular views. This study will consider: 1, Isaiah, chapters: 1:18-31; 2:6-21; 3:1-4:6; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9:1-6; 10; 11:1-12:6; 14:24-27; 17:12-14; 18; 22:1-14; 28-33; 37-39; 2, II Kings, chapter 19:6-7, 20-34.

Even a casual glance at the Assyrian oracles reveals that there are two general and conflicting views of, or attitudes toward, Assyria in relationship to Judah.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Isaiah ben Amoz is regarded as the prophet who lived and worked during the eighth century B. C., in Judah, and who is responsible for the first thirty-nine chapters, in the main, of the book which bears his name.

The phrase philosophy of history as applied to Isaiah ben Amoz, is used to denote his interpretation of the relationship between Yahweh, the national god of the Hebrews, and the nations, and between Yahweh and the events of history.

The term Hebrew is used to designate the people included in the two kingdoms, Israel and Judah. When the northern kingdom is intended, Israel will be used; when the southern kingdom, the designation Judah will be employed.

III. REASONS FOR THIS INVESTIGATION

A clear insight into Isaiah's philosophy of history is highly important for a proper understanding of the prophet and his book. Proper relationships between the various oracles and their historical settings, and similarly, proper exegesis of the oracles, depend upon what is to be included in or excluded from his view of Yahweh's relationship to the world.

Again, our present world conditions demand light on and knowledge of certain eternal truths if it is to endure. The book of Isaiah has been generally recognized as containing much of these eternal truths. Not only did the prophet live during times and under conditions similar in many respects to the present day; he set forth, according to some, a philosophy of history which, if followed, would have met the challenge of his times and which, if heeded, promises to meet the needs of the present age.

IV. THE NEED FOR THIS STUDY

The need for this particular study is further evident in the fact that few have concerned themselves with the prophet's view of history and Yahweh's relationship to it, in a comprehensive and thorough-going manner. At best, insofar as the present writer is aware, only a few general statements have been made with reference to it. To be sure,

everyone who has dealt with the pertinent passages, commentators, as well as others, has to a degree, discussed the prophet's philosophy of history. What has not been presented is the philosophy as a separate entity in its totality. Various ones have selected a few passages and elaborated upon them, or, have referred the philosophy to passages that have no authentic bearing on the subject. Moreover, there is a need for this study inasmuch as Isaiah's philosophy, correctly presented, has not been analyzed with t he end in view of noting its component parts. Finally, there is a need to clarify and explain the philosophy as to its relevance for Isaiah's own times and for present world conditions.

V. HISTORY OF LITERATURE ON THE SUBJECT

Specific literature on Isaiah's philosophy of history, as has been intimated, is very meagre. According to the present writer's knowledge, Renan[1] was the first among comparatively modern scholars to give definite consideration to it. In keeping with the interpretation of most scholars of the older period in biblical criticism, and certainly in keeping with traditional views, he regarded Isaiah 10:5 through chapter 12 as containing the prophet's philosophy

---

[1] Ernest Renan, History of the People of Israel (Boston: Robert's Brothers, 1894), III, 3.

of history. Referring to this passage, he claims that it "contains the complete theory of Providence as understood by the prophets, a theory which has remained the universal philosophy of history down to Bossuet's day."[2]

Without entering into a discussion of the validity of Renan's statement, it should be noted that all those who, like him, discuss Isaiah's philosophy in relation to the passage cited, do so inadequately. In the first place, all the so-called Assyrian passages, in addition to the material in II Kings and in the Messianic oracles, must be dealt with in order to grasp the prophet's views. Those who limit themselves to a few texts fail to that extent to grapple with the problem. In the second place, the authenticity of some of the texts considered is so open to question as to in invalidate the discussion, however elaborate it might be. Then, again, some who have discussed the same, or similar passages, have done so under the heading "Providence."

It is under this latter heading that Skinner[3] considers it, making, in the meantime, perhaps the greatest contribution of all to the theme. Confining himself to

---

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] John Skinner, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, Chapters I-XXXIX (Cambridge: University Press, 1915), pp. xxxviii ff.

Isaiah 10:5-34 in this particular discussion he does popularize the idea of Isaiah's having set forth a philosophy of history, and goes into detail in his discussion of this particular passage. Here again, however, it must be noted that Isaiah's philosophy is to be seen only in respect to the total number of pertinent passages, and not confined to one, or a few.

Cornill gives to the discussion one direct paragraph in which the key sentence reads, "In Isaiah we find for the first time a clearly perceived conception of universal history."[4] He does not refer to any specific passage.

In one very worthy paragraph, Glazebrook uses the specific phrase with reference to Isaiah, even though his conclusions may be questioned. Says he:

> It is not because he freed himself from all the particularist prejudices of his age, nor because he attained a complete system of theology, nor because he formed a consistent theory of providence, that Isaiah holds the first place among the Hebrew prophets. He did none of these things. He left many questions to be answered by the great prophet of the sixth century, or later still. . . . If in Isaiah's inspired intuition we find the germs of a true monotheism, of a philosophy of history, and of the conception of human brotherhood, then we cannot but

---

[4] Carl Heinrich Cornill, Der israelitische Prophetismus (Achte bis zehnte Auflage; Straszburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1912), pp. 56-57.

assign to him the highest rank among the chosen vessels of revelation.[5]

McFadyen follows Skinner, and seems to borrow his ideas, in giving a passing reference to the same thought as regards chapter 10:5-34.[6]

Referring to Isaiah 5:12; 10:12,23; 14:24,26 ff.; and to 28:21 ff., Edward Chauncey Baldwin devotes a page in his book, Our Modern Debt to Israel, to the subject. "It was Isaiah, the statesman, who first formulated a real philosophy of history," he declares.[7]

One line is the contribution of L. Elliott Binns to the immediate discussion at hand. With reference to Isaiah, he writes, "He taught the beginnings of a philosophy of history and saw that though the nation might perish a remnant would survive."[8]

Leo L. Honor[9] uses the phrase with reference to

---

[5] M. G. Glazebrook, Studies in the Book of Isaiah (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), pp. 100-101.

[6] John Edgar McFadyen, The Book of the Prophecies of Isaiah (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910), p. 94.

[7] Edward Chauncey Baldwin, op. cit., (Boston: Sherman, French & Company, 1913), p. 45.

[8] L. Elliott Binns, The Jewish People and Their Faith (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), p. 60.

[9] Leo L. Honor, Sennacherib's Invasion of Palestine (New York: Columbia University Press, 1926), pp. 78 ff.

Isaiah several times but does not discuss it.

In discussing Isaiah 10:5-11, T. H. Robinson[10] gives a paragraph to it and says, "Here the stress is laid on a philosophy of history." Previously he had made a greater contribution in his book, Prophecy and the Prophets, where, with respect to chapter 10:5, 6, 7-11, 24-26, he says that Isaiah developed a genuine philosophy of history.

Similarly, Oesterley[11] and Robinson state that chapter 10:5-9 forms a poem in which Assyria is denounced, and the prophet's philosophy of history is enunciated.

Making use of II Kings 18:9-19:37; and Isaiah 36; 37; 10:5-19, George Barclay devotes a splendid chapter to the subject, along popular and traditional lines, without directly using the phrase "philosophy of history."[12]

W. Arthur Faus[13] makes use of the phrase with reference to Isaiah, but hardly does more than make mention of it. He limits himself to 10:15a, 16, and that by way of illustration.

---

[10] T. H. Robinson, The Decline and Fall of the Hebrew Kingdoms (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1930), p. 158; and, op. cit., (London: Duckworth, 1923), p. 95.

[11] W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934), p. 246.

[12] George Barclay, The Bible Speaks to our Day (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1945), Chap. II.

[13] W. Arthur Faus, The Genius of the Prophets (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946), p. 169.

From the foregoing review it is seen that in the instances where the specific phrase is used, hardly more than mention is made of it. No clear and thorough exposition is given, nor is an analysis made of it. Where a fuller discussion has been entered into, the passages dealt with have been either too limited or based upon texts which are to a large degree doubtful as to authenticity. Hence, all the greater need for the present undertaking.

VI. METHOD OF APPROACH

This study will seek to discover the sources for Isaiah's philosophy of history; present the history of the times in which the prophet lived; relate the prophet to his times; discuss the nature of the prophet's view of history, state, and give an exposition of it; and to present an evaluation of the prophet's philosophy of history, and relate it to the present day.

In the attempt to discover the sources for the prophet's philosophy of history, the particular texts, which may or may not contain expressions of it, will be studied in the light of biblical criticism. Thus, it is hoped, the authenticity of the pertinent passages will be reasonably proved or disproved, and the prophet's genuine views be set forth. To this task the first chapter will be devoted.

Chapter II will present a historical sketch of the

times in which the prophet lived, while chapter III will relate the prophet to his times. In chapter IV, the nature of the prophet's philosophy of history will be discussed, the philosophy stated, and an exposition of it given. Chapter V will present an evaluation of the prophet's philosophy of history, and relate it to the present day.

Throughout the study, the biblical version used in English is that of the American Revised, Standard edition, 1881-1885, published by Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York. In Hebrew, Biblia Hebraica, second edition, edited by Rudolph Kittel, and published by Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1912, is employed. Except where it is self-evident, or is indicated, all translations from German, French, and Hebrew are those of the investigator. A table of abbreviations is provided at the end of the dissertation proper. All dates, unless otherwise specifically indicated, are B. C.

CHAPTER I

A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE SOURCES

In order to arrive at any conclusions as to what Isaiah's philosophy of history was, it is necessary to trace his attitudes towards Assyria and Judah, particularly, from the beginning to the end of his long career, insofar as these can be ascertained. Four different aspects of these attitudes call for consideration, the first general, the others specific: 1, his attitudes at the very beginning of his career in regard to the general situations or conditions about him; 2, his early attitudes towards Assyria and Judah, particularly; 3, his attitudes towards the immediate future of the Assyrian armies[14] and the populace of Judah, and 4, his attitude toward the future of the remnant.

Concerning the first of these, the prophet's general attitudes at the very beginning of his career,[15] there is little, if any, problem. It is generally acknowledged that he began his work much in the vein of Amos, preaching right-

---

[14] Even so conservative a scholar as S. R. Driver pointed out years ago that Isaiah never announces the fall of the Assyrian Empire generally. See his Isaiah: His Life and Times (London: James Nisbet and Co., n. d.), p. 126.

[15] For a good statement on this period of the prophet's career, see J. Skinner, op. cit., p. xxvii.

eousness, and judgment to come (5:1-25). This judgment was to be concentrated eventually in a terrifying "Day of Yahweh" (2:6-19), when all that was proud and lofty would be abased. With regard to his own people, he conceived of the destruction as so complete that if a tenth remained, it too would be almost extirpated (6:13). Equally acceptable is the thought that, somewhat like Amos, and yet unlike him, Isaiah viewed complete and total destruction, at least for Judah, as not being the final word. For Judah, there would be a remnant left over (7:3).

With regard to the second, his attitudes towards Assyria and Judah, particularly, before 722, the fall of Samaria, there is likewise little if any question. It is to be noted, as Skinner points out, that "his criticism becomes more incisive and discriminating as time goes on."[16] From a general picture of destruction he turned to more specific features and announced by inference that Assyria (5:26-29) was to be Yahweh's instrument or executor of judgment and destruction.

When the investigator approaches the third, he runs into problems which will never permit of absolute solution. The oracles which deal with the future of Assyria and Judah, immediate or remote, do not permit of any absolutely objective solution, and many different views are held. In

---

[16] Loc. cit.

fact, scholars are not so much as agreed as to what oracles should be considered in order to determine the prophet's attitude. Then, too, even when agreement is reached on a particular oracle, problems arise concerning its authenticity, and date. Generally speaking, the pertinent passages are the so-called Assyrian oracles in the book of Isaiah and in II Kings. As concerns these Assyrian oracles, it has been customary to regard those that depict Assyria as an agent of Yahweh to effect his judgment on Judah as pro-Assyrian, while those that deal with Assyria's downfall are regarded as anti-Assyrian. The former deal with Judah's, even Jerusalem's destruction; the latter, with the destruction of the Assyrian armies after they have completed the task of judgment assigned to them by Yahweh.

It has been a rather general assumption, and still is, that during the period from the beginning of his career down to 705 or even to 701, or even later still, Isaiah viewed Assyria in a favorable light, while he viewed Judah as an object of merited destruction--except for the remnant. Beginning in 705-701, he altered his attitude, pronouncing then the destruction of the Assyrian armies, and the inviolability of Jerusalem, or Zion.[17]

---

[17] A classical exposition of this view is that given by Fritz Wilke, Jesaja und Asshur (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1905).

Over against this assumption is that which regards the prophet as consistent throughout his career. He proclaimed judgment and doom upon Judah till the end of his career; he never pronounced the inviolability of Jerusalem, and he never pronounced doom upon the Assyrians.[18]

Number four among the attitudes presents much the same problem or problems as number three: authenticity, and date--with no agreement on what should be included and vice versa. Within these two extremes, there are, to be sure,all sorts of degrees of opinion.

A cross section of opinion as regards the oracles which depict the prophet's attitudes during his career is of benefit at this point. It shows how different scholars are arrayed for or against the authenticity and date of the specific passages in question, and helpsthe investigator to form his own opinions relative to what may or may not be included in the prophet's philosophy of history.

Turning, then, to the oracles which discuss Assyria and Judah in both a favorable and unfavorable light, the greatest problems of all must be faced. What is genuine, and what is not? When were the authentic passages in question produced? First, the so-called pro-Assyrian prophecies

---

[18] Kemper Fullerton was, in his later days, a worthy champion of this school, in America.

will be presented. The possible ones are chapters: 1:18-31; 2:6-21; 3:1-4:1; 5:1-29: 6; 7; 8:5-8a, 14b-15, 21-22; 10:1-3(4); 22:1-14; 28:14-22; 29:1-8; 30:1-17; 31:1-4; and 32:9-14. In their turn, the so-called anti-Assyrian oracles will be investigated in like manner. The possible ones to be considered are 1, Isaiah, chapters: 8:(8b) 9-10, 16; 9: 1-7 (8:23b-9:6); 10:5-34; 14:24-27; 17:12-14; 18; 28:5-6; 29:5-8; 30:18-26, 27-33; 31:4-9; 33; 37:6-7, 21-35; 2, II Kings, chapter 19:6-7, 20-34. Finally, the oracles which depict the future of the remnant will be treated. Those to be considered are within the book of Isaiah: 2:2-4; 4:2-6; 9:2-7 and 11:1-9.

I. PRO-ASSYRIAN OR ANTI-JUDEAN ORACLES

A. 1:18-31. Within this passage are two instances of judgment: verses 24-26, and 29-31. Verses 27-28 are generally regarded as a post-Exilic addition.[19] Verses 29-31 are viewed by some as a fragment applicable to Israel before 722,[20] or, are rejected entirely.[21] This leaves verses 24-26 to be considered. The passage, 21-26, is regarded as genuine by Box, Cheyne, Duhm, Glazebrook, Gray Kissane, Mitchell, Skinner, Wade, Whitehouse, not to mention

---

[19] Box, Cheyne, Duhm, possibly Gray, McFadyen, Pfeiffer, Skinner, Whitehouse, and others.

[20] Duhm, Skinner, Wade, Whitehouse.

[21] Pfeiffer.

others. This cross section represents scholars of all shades of opinion.

Opinion as to date ranges all the way from 740 to 701. Glazebrook regards the verses as the earliest word Isaiah spoke as a prophet, while Cheyne dates them during Sennacherib's invasion, but before the blockade of Jerusalem. Kissane and Skinner refer them to 735, and shortly after the attack by Rezin and Pekah, respectively. Mitchell assigns them to 720. Kellner, like Cheyne, places them in 701.

B. 2:6-21. These verses, according to the arrangement of Duhm, which is followed by Cheyne and others, contain two distinct oracles of judgment: verses 6-10 plus 18-21, and verses 11-17. Box, Cheyne, Duhm, Mitchell, Skinner, Wade, and Whitehouse agree as to authenticity, with Gray concurring but arranging the material in a different manner. Pfeiffer accepts the authenticity of the material, in the main. Both oracles are assigned generally to the period 740-735. The "Day of Yahweh" is applicable to Judah also.

C. 3:1-4:1. Within this passage, verses 10, 11, 18-23, and 25, 26 are generally viewed as interpolations.[22]

---

[22] Box, Cheyne, Duhm, Gray (?), McFadyen, Mitchell, Skinner.

The remainder is accepted as genuine by Box, Cheyne, Duhm, Gray, Kissane, McFadyen, Skinner, Wade, and Whitehouse. Pfeiffer accepts most of it. Apparently Gray accepts verses 25, 26, as does Whitehouse definitely. Skinner seems to favor also verses 18-23. Those who date the passage assign it to around 735, except Whitehouse who favors 726.

D. 5:1-29. Except for verses 15, 16, the material is viewed as containing three or more oracles of judgment. Box, Cheyne, Duhm, McFadyen, and Pfeiffer definitely apply verses 1-7 to Judah. The second section of the chapter, verses 8-24, is likewise, generally referred to Judah. Verses 25-29, which most scholars place after 9:7-10:4, is applied to Israel. Some feel, however, that the passage is equally applicable to Judah.[23]

According to Skinner, "By the consent of nearly all critics 1-7 and 8-24 belong to the first period of Isaiah's career, . . ."[24]

E. 6. Skinner states that this chapter is now universally acknowledged as recording Isaiah's initiation into the office of a prophet, and that it was written after a

---

[23] Box, McFadyen, Wilke, Kennett.

[24] Skinner, op. cit., p. 34.

lapse of time.[25] Buttenwieser,[26] however, feels that the call and the account coincide. Verse 13 is interpreted as picturing only unrelieved doom: if a tenth remain, it will either be carried away captive or destroyed with fire.[27] According to Buttenwieser,[28] the majority of scholars view the last clause as a later addition. J. M. P. Smith[29] also maintains that there is no element of hope in the prophet's call.

F. 7. Kissane[30] notes that the Isaian origin of verses 1-9, at least in substance, is admitted by modern critics. Shear-jashub (verse 3) is regarded as embodying judgment as well as hope by Cheyne, Duhm, Gray, McFadyen, Kissane, Skinner, and Wade. The latter part of verse 9 also contains a note of threatening.[31] Another threat is seen in verses 10-13, where the prophet seems to make a

---

[25] Ibid., p. 44.

[26] Moses Buttenwieser, The Prophets of Israel (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914), p. 256.

[27] Cheyne, Duhm, Gray, Mitchell, Wade.

[28] Buttenwieser, op. cit., p. 257

[29] J. M. P. Smith, "Isaiah and the Future," A. J. S. L. L. XL (July, 1924), 252, 257.

[30] Edward J. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Limited, 1941), I, 77.

[31] Kissane, Mitchell, Wade.

distinction between his God and the god of Ahaz.[32] Verses 14-17 are likewise viewed by many as containing a threat.[33] That verses 18-25, though consisting of a number of fragments, contain some authentic material is generally agreed.[34] The date of the chapter, in the main, is the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic War.

G. 8:5-8a, 14b-15, 21-22. These sections are accepted as authentic, and as pronouncing doom upon Judah, by Box, Cheyne, Duhm, Gray, McFadyen, Mitchell, Skinner, and Wade. Whitehouse accepts the passages also, but he connects verse 8 with the following verses in such a way as to relieve the note of doom. Here, also, the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic War appears to be self-evident.

H. 10:1-3(4). Box, Buttenwieser, Cheyne, Duhm, and others, make a continuous prophecy of 9:7-10:4, to which they add 5:25(26)-29(30), applying the whole to Judah as of concern for Judah only. Gray and Wade doubt their being an original part of 9:7 ff., plus 5:25 ff., and, as by them-

---

[32] Boutflower, Duhm, Gray, Kissane, Wade, et al.

[33] G. B. Gray, The Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), p. 129, states that since J. D. Michaelis, most modern interpreters treat verse 16 as a threat. He lists Koppe, Gesenius, Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Cheyne, Duhm, Marti, Skinner, and Peake.

[34] Box, Buttenwieser, Cheyne, Duhm, Gray, Whitehouse, et al.

selves, referring to Judah. Kissane[35] states that the majority of scholars maintain that at least 10:1-4 refers to Judah.

I. 22:1-14. The utter confusion of scholars over this passage is clearly demonstrated by Leo L. Honor.[36] According to different assumptions that might be made, no fewer than six different views are possible relative to the meaning and occasion of the oracle.

> Most moderns have fixed on some episode in Hezekiah's conflict with Sennacherib--the moment, perhaps, when after the Judean king's ignominious submission, the Assyrian force that had begun the blockade of Jerusalem was retiring.[37]

It seems quite safe to say that the original words of Isaiah in the passage were words of threat and doom.[38]

J. 28:14-22. Scholars seem to be generally agreed that a note of judgment is contained in the substance of these verses which are, in the main, Isaiah's.[39] Whatever element of hope there may be in verse 16 applies only

---

[35] Kissane, op. cit., p. 114.

[36] Honor, op. cit., pp. 104 ff.

[37] G. H. Box, The Book of Isaiah (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909), p. 100.

[38] J. McFadyen, op. cit., p. 15.

[39] Box, Buttenwieser, Cheyne, Delitzsch, Duhm, T. H. Robinson, Wade, and Whitehouse.

to the believers, or the prophet's inner circle of disciples.[40] The date favored by many scholars is 703-701.[41]

K. 29:1-4(5-8). There seems to be little doubt among scholars now that these verses contain a definite oracle of judgment against Jerusalem. Even so cautious a scholar as Whitehouse regards verses 1-4 as a separate and distinct oracle of doom. Concerning verses 5-8, he says,

> It hardly seems possible to regard these verses as forming an immediate sequence to the preceding, in which the desperate plight of Jerusalem is portrayed. . . . Here, as in the closing verses of chap. xxviii (viz. verses 23-29), the editor of the collection contrives that the brighter passages shall relieve the darker.[42]

Duhm, who seems to have given most weight to the view that verses 5-8 are authentic, finally gave up the genuineness of the passage in the third edition of his commentary.[43]

---

[40] Cheyne, Delitzsch, McFadyen, Skinner, Wade.

[41] Box, Kissane, and Wade over against Buttenwieser who places the passage in 722 or before, and Whitehouse who dates it 711 or later.

[42] Owen C. Whitehouse, Isaiah. I-XXXIX (Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, n. d.), pp. 305 ff.

[43] According to Kemper Fullerton, "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hopes for the Future," J. B. L. XLI (1922), 46 f., footnote 100.

Cheyne[44] deletes 4b, most of 5, 7-8, and adds verse 6 to 4a. According to him, the author of verses 5, 7, and 8, has before him a future day when all nations should gather together against the "holy city," and be cut off. Buttenwieser[45] adds 5c-6 to verses 1-4, making the doom all the more terrible. Scholars date the passage 705-701.

L. 30:1-17. This passage is regarded as genuine, except possibly verses 6, and 7, although it may not be considered a unity, by Box, Buttenwieser, Cheyne, Delitzsch, Duhm, Kissane, Skinner, Wade, and Whitehouse. The date accepted varies between 704 and 701.

M. 31:1-4. The deciding note in this passage is whether Yahweh is to be thought of as fighting upon or against Mount Zion in verse 4. Even Delitzsch, McFadyen, T. H. Robinson, Wade, and Whitehouse decide in favor of against. According to Fullerton,[46] when once criticism carried away chapters 28-33, 31:5-9 (as a continuation of verses 1-4, and as anti-Assyrian) was carried away also. Fullerton[47] notes further that Duhm, in the third edition

---

[44] T. K. Cheyne, Introduction to the Book of Isaiah (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1895), p. 189.

[45] M. Buttenwieser, op. cit., pp. 265 ff.

[46] K. Fullerton, op. cit., p. 47.

[47] Ibid., pp. 46 f., footnote 100.

of his commentary, gave up verse 9.

N. 32:9-14. Whitehouse[48] makes the statement that the opinions of recent critics from the time of Kuenen till the most recent commentator, Marti (1900), have with increasing unanimity promounced against the Isaian authorship of any portion of chapter 32, Duhm being the only notable exception. In this connection also, Fullerton[49] declares that when Stade swept away chapter 33, chapter 32 was carried away with it. Those who do accept the chapter, and hence, these verses, as authentic: Duhm, Skinner, and Whitehouse, assign it to the earlier years of the prophet's career.

II. ANTI-ASSYRIAN ORACLES

A. 8:(8b) 9-10. Some authorities maintain that an anti-Assyrian oracle begins with the second half of verse 8, and ends with verse 10.[50] Others treat 8b as irrelevant to what precedes or follows it and delete it from both contexts.[51] Still others add it to verses 5-8a,[52] making it a

---

[48] O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., pp. 327 ff.

[49] K. Fullerton, op. cit., p. 46.

[50] Cheyne, Gray, McFadyen.

[51] Box, Duhm.

[52] Mitchell, Skinner, Wade, Whitehouse.

part of the threat contained in those verses.[53] Agreement among scholars has been reached on neither the meaning nor the occasion of the verse, whether it is referred to the preceding or the succeeding context. Attempts at emendation have been made by Cheyne who refers the "out-stretched wings" to Yahweh in a protecting manner.[54]

It is to be noted that the oracle is one of those that refer to "the nations;"[55] all of which have been rejected by Stade and his followers.[56] Cheyne presents a good argument against the view of Stade when he says, "It is too bold to assert that the prophets of the 8th cent. never have a large group of peoples ("all the nations") within their view."[57]

Among those who accept at least verses 9-10 as genuine are Box, Cheyne, Duhm, Mitchell, Skinner, Wade and Whitehouse. Opposed to authenticity are Fullerton, Gray, Kent, Pfeiffer, and J. M. P. Smith. Duhm,[58] who isolates

---

[53] See above, p. 9.

[54] T. K. Cheyne, op. cit., p. 39.

[55] K. Fullerton, op. cit., p. 8, lists among these: 8:9 f.; 17:12-14; 29:5-8; 33; and 14:24-27, in which "all nations" are mentioned along with Assyria.

[56] See Fullerton, Ibid., pp. 20 ff.

[57] T. K. Cheyne, op. cit., p. 38.

[58] Bernhard Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892), p. 59.

verse 8b, deprives 9-10 of much of its consolatory nature when he argues that the latter part of verse 10, "for with us is God," is here trivial in the mouth of the prophet.[59]

B. 9:1-7 (8:23b-9:6). This oracle, though distinctly Messianic, should be considered particularly because of verses 4-5. Herein it is stated that the Messianic Age has either dawned or will dawn[60]--because the yoke of the oppressor has been broken.

According to Duhm,[61] the prophecy begins properly at verse 2b. He regards it as having been uttered when Assyria's overlordship had been broken, the Davidic son already born, and the Kingdom of David set up for all time. The passage is assigned by him to the last times of the prophet, and is considered a noteworthy contradictory bit to 1:2-17.[62] Box, Louise P. Smith, and Wade follow closely in Duhm's footprints in their view of the oracle. Driver, Mitchell, Skinner, and Kissane accept the passage as genuine also, but date it in 735.

---

[59] Ibid, p. 60.

[60] From verse 2 the event could be regarded as past; from verses 6 ff. it might be viewed as a future event. For a discussion of this point, see Gray, op. cit., pp. 165 ff.

[61] B. Duhm, op. cit., p. 65.

[62] Ibid., p. 66.

An increasing number of scholars has come to deny the authenticity of 9:1-7. According to Gray,[63] the Isaianic authorship seems to have been first questioned by Stade; then by H. Hackmann, Cheyne, Marti, and R. H. Kennett. In more recent years, Fullerton,[64] J. M. P. Smith,[65] and Pfeiffer[66] have contested against its genuineness. These scholars assign the passage to Exilic or post-Exilic times.

C. 10:5-34 and 14:24-27. Since these two passages have long been considered as related to each other, they will be dealt with together. Taken as a unity by many scholars, they have been viewed as setting forth the prophet's philosophy of history--especially so when followed by chapters 11 and 12. They are, therefore, of utmost importance in the present undertaking.

1. 10:5-34. Some earlier scholars, Gesenius,[67] for example, regarded these verses as an authentic unity to which 14:24-27 should be added, and the new entity followed by chapter 11. In later years, Cheyne[68] considered 14:

---

[63] G. B. Gray, op. cit., pp. 167 ff.

[64] K. Fullerton, op. cit., pp. 37-40, 64, 87.

[65] J. M. P. Smith, "Isaiah and the Future," A. J. S. L. L. XL (July, 1924), 252 ff.

[66] R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941), p. 417.

[67] See T. K. Cheyne, op. cit., p. 79.

[68] T. K. Cheyne, loc. cit.

24-27 as belonging more properly after verse 14 or 15 of chapter 10. Duhm[69] divides the passage into a number of fragments of which only 5-9 and 13-14 are authentic. Cheyne[70] and Pfeiffer[71] follow Duhm in this conclusion. Gray[72] considers the passage as consisting of three units: (a) verses 5-9, 13-14(15), to which verses 16-19 may also belong; (b) verses 27c-32, and (c) verses 33-34. According to him, Isaiah might probably be the author of 5-7, 13 f. in (a); there are no conclusive positive arguments for or against his authorship of (b) and (c); and the dates of the poems can not be very closely determined. The prose addenda are late. The only verses universally regarded as authentic, according to Skinner,[73] are 5-9, 13-14.

It seems to be impossible, taking the passage as a whole, to form any definite and objective conclusions from criticism. The following points, however, may be observed: 1, all parts are not pertinent to an anti-Assyrian attitude; 2, sections which may be considered as definitely anti-

---

[69] B. Duhm op. cit., pp. 75 ff.

[70] T. K. Cheyne, op. cit., pp. 48 ff.

[71] R. H. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 436. Pfeiffer accepts verse 15 also.

[72] G. B. Gray, op. cit., p. 194.

[73] J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 93.

Assyrian are, roughly: 5-11, 12, 13-15, 16-19, possibly 24-26(27), and 33-34. Verses 5-11, 13-15 will be reserved for treatment until the last.

a. Verse 12. Taking the verses in order, Wade[74] says that 12 and 13a may be insertions. Skinner[75] regards verse 12 as the prophet's answer to the Assyrian boast. Even Kissane[76] regards it as a later addition. Duhm, Gray, Pfeiffer, and perhaps Cheyne, rule it out as not being authentic. Box[77] questions verses 10-12, and regards verse 12 as probably an editorial supplement, as do Kent[78] and Whitehouse.[79] Scholars of all shades of opinion, therefore, reject the verse.

b. Verses 16-19. Although Skinner appears to regard verses 5-19 as genuine, and the remaining oracles of the chapter as depending upon them and as written later, he states that it is difficult to suppose that the passage in

---

[74] G. W. Wade, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah (Second edition, revised; London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1929), p. 75.

[75] J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 95.

[76] E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 122.

[77] G. W. Box, op. cit., p. 62.

[78] Charles Foster Kent, The Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), p. 149.

[79] O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 163.

its present form has come from the hand of Isaiah.[80] Box[81] thinks that there is probably some Isaian material embedded in the verses. McFadyen[82] sees at least interference, by a later hand, in the passage. The verses, except 19, may be authentic, according to Gray's[83] views. Cheyne, Duhm, and Pfeiffer discard them, as has been pointed out previously.[84] Mitchell[85] joins these latter scholars and states:

> . . . These considerations make it probable, that as is held by several recent critics, vv. 16-19, and perhaps v. 15, were not called forth by the exigency that Isaiah had to face, but by a later condition of things from which God's people were thus encouraged to expect deliverance.[86]

c. Verses 24-26(27).[87] Skinner[88] does not commit himself on these verses, but regards them as connected with verses 16-19 rather than with 20-23. Cheyne, Duhm,

---

[80] J. Skinner, op. cit., pp. 91 ff.

[81] G. H. Box, op. cit., p. 64.

[82] J. E. McFadyen, op. cit., p. 97.

[83] G. B. Gray, op. cit., p. 194.

[84] Supra., p. 17.

[85] H. G. Mitchell, Isaiah A Study of Chapters I-XII (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Company, 1897), p. 229.

[86] Ibid., p. 234.

[87] Verse 27 is regarded as spurious by Cheyne, and as isolated by Skinner. It may be considered, with emandation, as belonging with verses 24-26.

[88] J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 99.

Gray, Mitchell, and Pfeiffer reject them along with Hackmann and Volz.[89] After making many emendations in the text, Wade[90] accepts the verses. Box[91] joins them with the succeeding verses and views them as having been edited late, but as containing some fragmentary writing of Isaiah. Kent[92] regards them as reflecting Isaiah's views toward the end of his life, and as being, in their present form, from post-Exilic writers who were careful students of the writings of the original Isaiah. Kissane is of the opinion that verse 26 should be omitted, with verse 12, as a later prose addition.[93]

d. Verses 33-34. Skinner[94] regards these verses, as do also Kent,[95] McFadyen,[96] and Wade,[97] as a continuation of verses 28-32. Whitehouse[98] accepts them as genuine

---

[89] Hackmann and Volz are included on the authority of K. Fullerton, "The Problem of Isaiah, Chapter 10," A. J. S. L. L. XXXIV (April, 1918, Reprint), 175 f.

[90] G. W. Wade, op. cit., pp. 78 ff.

[91] G. H. Box, op. cit., p. 65.

[92] C. F. Kent, op. cit., p. 150, footnote on section 57.

[93] E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 123.

[94] J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 102.

[95] C. F. Kent, op. cit., p. 150.

[96] J. E. McFadyen, op. cit., p. 100.

[97] G. W. Wade, op. cit., p. 79.

[98] O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 173.

but assigns them to a date different from that of the immediately preceding verses. Like Whitehouse, Box[99] takes them to be authentic, and feels that they are not to be regarded as following immediately upon verses 28 ff. They are considered a part of the Messianic oracle in 11:1 ff. by Louise P. Smith,[100] and by Kissane[101] who makes them anti-Judean. Gray, it will be remembered,[102] argues that there are no conclusive positive arguments for or against Isaiah's authorship. He, too, divorces them from 28-32, and surmises that they were put into their present position by a compiler.[103] Opposed definitely to authenticity are, as was noted previously, Cheyne, Duhm, Mitchell, and Pfeiffer.[104]

e. Verses 5-11, 13-15. Within this body of material verses 10-11 are generally regarded as editorial or superfluous[105] (along with verse 12). Scholars are more inclined to retain verse 15 than to dispense with

---

[99] G. W. Box, op. cit., p. 65.

[100] Louise P. Smith, "The Messianic Ideal of Isaiah," J. B. L. XXXVI (1917), 169.

[101] E. J. Kissane, op. cit., pp. 132 ff., p. 175.

[102] See above, p. 17

[103] G. B. Gray, op. cit., p. 211.

[104] See above, p. 19.

[105] Box, Cheyne, Duhm, Gray, Mitchell, for example.

it.[106]

Almost needless to say, the vast majority of scholars of all schools accept, at least, these verses as genuine, and regard them as the foundation of Isaiah's supposed change in attitude toward Assyria.[107] Assyria is guilty of blasphemy against Yahweh or sacrilege against his temple, and for this is to be destroyed (if for nothing else), and the idea is further developed to include destruction in the vicinity of the "holy city." Thus, Mitchell writes:

> . . . The tone of these verses is distinctly hostile. The first begins with the "woe" which introduces each of the curses of 5:8 ff. The reason for Yahweh's anger is given in detail, but there is no corresponding conclusion, . . . There must once have been one in the same form and style. It is required by the whole tone of the extant fragments, and it must have threatened the Assyrians with some kind of evil. In other words, in this mutilated prophecy is clear proof that Isaiah, when he came to see the Assyrians at close range, changed his mind with reference to them and represented Yahweh as sharing his disapprobation.[108]

Mitchell then goes on to state that some seek the missing conclusion in verses 33 f., while others seek it in 14:24-

---

[106] Gray, Mitchell, and Pfeiffer, joining with the usually more conservative scholars.

[107] For a comprehensive presentation of this subject, see K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," J. B. L. XLI (1922) 33 ff.

[108] H. G. Mitchell, "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," J. B. L. XXXVII (1918) 160.

27.[109]

Fullerton,[110] who accepts at least these verses, together with 27b-32, is concerned primarily with their relationship to the inviolability of Zion. He feels that as they stand the verses do imply this doctrine, and proceeds to alter the arrangement of the text so that they do not.[111] His conclusion is:

> . . . Verses 5-7a and 13-14 belonged originally together (vs 7b-9 may have been a parallel). The subject of these verses does not concern the extent of Assyria's conquests, but the theory upon which they were made. Assyria claims to make them in her own strength; Isaiah says, Assyria is only an instrument in the hand of Yahweh.[112]

The dating of the oracle has run nearly the whole gamut of the prophet's career.[113]

2. 14:24-27. This passage is placed as the conclusion of 10:5-34 by Gesenius[114] and Procksch;[115] of 10:

---

[109] Loc. cit.

[110] K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," p. 48. See also footnote 106.

[111] K. Fullerton, "The Problem of Isaiah, Chapter 10."

[112] K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints, " p. 49.

[113] For a good discussion of the date, see K. Fullerton, "The Problem of Isaiah, Chapter 10," pp. 172 ff.

[114] See above, p. 16, footnote 67.

[115] According to E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 175; also Gray, op. cit., p. 263.

5-32, by Condamin;[116] and after 10:5-14(15) by Cheyne,[117] Box,[118] and Kellner.[119] Gray[120] notes that it can not belong in the places assigned to it by these scholars, and under the influence of Stade and Marti, seems to refer it to post-Exilic times.

Among those who accept the passage as genuine are: Box, Cheyne, Driver,[121] Duhm, Kellner, Kissane, Mitchell,[122] Skinner, W. R. Smith, Wade, and Whitehouse. That it is spurious is the conclusion of Buttenwieser,[123] Fullerton,[124]

---

[116] According to E. J. Kissane, loc. cit.

[117] See above, p. 16.

[118] G. H. Box, op. cit., p. 63.

[119] M. L. Kellner, The Prophecies of Isaiah (Cambridge, Mass: Graves & Henry, 1895), pp. 10-11.

[120] G. B. Gray, op. cit., p. 263.

[121] S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (New Edition, Revised; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), p. 213.

[122] H. G. Mitchell, "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," J. B. L. XXXVII (1918), 160.

[123] M. Buttenwieser, op. cit., pp. 273 ff.

[124] K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," pp. 20 ff.

possibly Gray[125] and Kent,[126] Kennett,[127] Pfeiffer,[128] J. M. P. Smith,[129] and Marti.[130]

The dating of the oracle has been almost as great a problem as the dating of 10:5-9, 13-14. Those who accept it generally date it in 701. The opposition assigns it to Exilic or post-Exilic times.

D. 17:12-14. This passage is very much a critical bug-bear. Scholars can not agree as to whether it belongs to what precedes, to what follows, or is to be regarded as independent. Neither can they readh harmony as to whom it refers, nor as to date.

Some critics regard it as the continuation of verses 1-11.[131] Gesenius, Ewald, Dillmann, Kuenen, Duhm, and many

---

[125] G. B. Gray, op. cit., p. 263.

[126] C. F. Kent, op. cit., p. 150, footnote on section 57.

[127] R. H. Kennett, The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology (London: Oxford University Press, 1910), p. 84.

[128] R. H. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 436.

[129] J. M. P. Smith, op. cit.

[130] K. Marti, Das Buch Jesaja (Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900), pp. 129 f.

[131] So J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 146.

others make it the first part of the prophecy in 18:1 ff.[132] It is considered independent by Skinner,[133] Gray,[134] Wade,[135] and by Procksch and Feldmann.[136]

Ewald[137] makes it applicable, along with 18:1-7 and 14:24-27, not to Assyria, but to Ethiopia. Hitzig[138] refers it to Rezin and Pekah rather than to Assyria. The agents of destruction upon the Assyrians are the Medes, according to Kissane.[139]

Hitzig and Delitzsch date it in 735; Cheyne in 723.[140] Most critics refer it to the days of Sennacherib.[141]

---

[132] According to Cheyne, op. cit., p. 94, footnote 2. See also Gray, op. cit., p. 305.

[133] J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 146.

[134] G. B. Gray, op. cit., pp. 303 ff.

[135] G. W. Wade, op. cit., p. 120.

[136] Procksch and Feldmann are included on the authority of E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 202.

[137] H. Ewald, The Prophet Isaiah Chapters I-XXXIII (O. Glover, translator, Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1869), p. 123.

[138] So T.K. Cheyne, op. cit., pp. 94-95, footnote.

[139] E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 206.

[140] According to G. B. Gray, op. cit., p. 304.

[141] So O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 221.

Stade[142] and Marti regard it as post-Exilic, as does Fullerton.[143]

In view of the general confusion among scholars, comments from two different and independent sources may be of help in arriving at an objective conclusion. The first of these notes that:

> At the close of this little collection [oracles on Damascus and Israel] we have an oracle in xvii 12-14 (3:3) which does not obviously refer to any people. It may, however, have been assumed by the compiler to date from the same period as the preceding oracles, i.e. circa 735 B. C.[144]

In the second, after presenting a summary of possibilities and views, Leo L. Honor writes:

> . . . It is important to note that the prediction in this oracle is very vague, and that the relation between the prediction and the story of the plague is implicit, rather than explicit.[145]

E. Chapter 18. Except for verse 7, which is either questioned or rejected outright by many outstanding scholars, this chapter is regarded as being not only genuine[146] but

---

[142] Loc. cit.

[143] K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," pp. 20 ff.

[144] W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, op. cit., p. 250.

[145] L. Honor, op. cit., p. 96.

[146] Box, Cheyne, Duhm, Gray, Hackmann, Pfeiffer, Wade, and Whitehouse.

anti-Assyrian as well.[147] According to Leo Honor, the most common assumption in regard to the background of the prophecy is that Isaiah is addressing Ethiopian ambassadors, who have come to Jerusalem, in order to offer assistance against Assyria. Isaiah refuses the offer because human assistance is not needed; Divine assistance is to be given. Then the entire world is called upon to witness the overthrow of Assyria, through Divine intervention.[148] Even those who accept it unquestionably are faced with problems of date, emendations and glosses.[149]

Over against those who accept it for genuine, and as being of concern for Assyria in relationship with Judah are 1, some who, adding verses 5-6 only to chapter 17:1-11, refer it to the Syrians and Ephraimites,[150] and 2, some

---

[147] G. H. Box, op. cit., p. 89, serves as a good example.

[148] L. Honor, loc. cit.

[149] For a good discussion of the date within the Sennacherib period, see L. Honor, op. cit., pp. 97 ff. Kissane, op. cit., p. 203, holds out for 711 over against the many who date it in 702 or in 701. Oesterley and Robinson, op. cit., p. 250, waver between 711 and 701. Box, op. cit., p. 90, and Gray, op. cit., pp. 306 ff. give a clear picture of the confusion in the text.

[150] Marti, according to Honor, op. cit., p. 115, footnote 42. H. G. Mitchell seems to accept Marti's conclusions, "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," J. B. L. XXXVII (1918), 161.

who reject it on grounds of ambiguity, or as being post-Exilic, or both.[151]

Concerning the general nature of the prophecy, Honor says, "This prophecy does not contain any direct allusions, consequently, its meaning is not clear."[152] Fullerton points out with an exclamation that Assyria is not even mentioned.[153] And, after attacking the views of Marti and Duhm with respect to verses 4-6, Buttenwieser states:

> . . . To this must be added that neither vv. 5 and 6 nor the preceding verses furnish any clue as to who the people are that are to be left as prey to the carrion-birds and beasts--a point which bears further evidence to the fragmentariness of the whole passus. In view of this fragmentary character and the general obscurity of vv. 3-6, it remains uncertain even whether these verses are in any way related to 1-2, i.e., whether they are, either all or in part, the residua of a prophecy which, as it would seem from vv. 1-2 Isaiah delivered on the occasion of the arrival of envoys from "beyond the rivers of Kush" in Jerusalem . . .[154]

These statements concerning the general nature of the prophecy find substantiation in Gray's observation, although Gray himself appears to accept the poem as genuinely anti-Assyrian.[155]

---

[151] Buttenwieser, Fullerton, Kennett.

[152] L. Honor, op. cit., p. 96.

[153] K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," p. 48, See also pp. 49-51.

[154] M. Buttenwieser, op. cit., pp. 279 f.

[155] G. B. Gray, op. cit., pp. 307 f.

F. Chapter 28. Insofar as this investigation has been able to discover, there are three possible instances of material that may be regarded as anti-Assyrian, or as implying the inviolability of Zion.[156] These are: verses 5-6, which may be taken as referring, somehow, to Assyria; verse 16, which some have regarded as teaching Zion's indestructibility, and verses 23-29, which have been regarded in a few instances as also implying the inviolability of the "holy city."

Only two authorities, out of fourteen investigated, definitely accept verses 5-6 as genuine.[157] In possibly three instances out of thirteen, as concerns verse 16, is the inviolability of Jerusalem (Zion) inferred.[158] And, as concerns verses 23-29: even among those who accept it as genuine,[159] only two infer Zion's inviolability.[160]

---

[156] The authorities investigated were: Box, Cheyne, Duhm, Fullerton, Hackmann, Kennett, Kent, Kissane, McFadyen, Pfeiffer, Skinner, W. R. Smith, Wade, and Whitehouse.

[157] E. J. Kissane, op. cit., pp. 308 ff., and W. R. Smith, The Prophets of Israel and Their Place in History (Second Edition; London: A & C. Black, Ltd., 1928). pp. 282 f.

[158] Definitely W. R. Smith, op. cit., p. 285. Possibly O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 298-see also p. 306; and J. E. McFadyen, op. cit., pp. 184 f.

[159] Among those who do, either outright or with reservations, are: Box, Duhm, Kissane, McFadyen, Skinner, W. R. Smith, Wade, and Whitehouse (23-28).

[160] Definitely W. R. Smith, loc. cit.; possibly Box, op. cit., p. 128.

G. 29:5-8.[161] These verses have been discussed previously, to a certain extent, in connection with verses 1-4.[162] By some scholars they are considered a continuation of verses 1 ff., with two different views resulting: 1, they are made to continue the note of doom upon Jerusalem;[163] 2, they are coupled with the doom upon Jerusalem, but viewed as consolatory.[164] Still others view them as an independent oracle.[165]

Among those who regard them as a continuation of the first four verses, and as a part of the judgment upon Jerusalem, are Cheyne, Buttenwieser, Marti, and Kent. Closely akin to the reconstruction made by Cheyne and Buttenwieser[166] is that of Marti who limits verses 1-8 to 1-4a, 5c, 6, omitting the rest of 5, 7, and 8 as later non-Isaianic additions, and makes the judgment apply to Jerusalem, rather than to Assyria.[167] In this same

---

[161] Verses 16-24 are not included, since many of the most important scholars do not regard them as Isaiah's. Among these are: Box, Cheyne, Duhm, Skinner, and Mitchell.

[162] Supra, pp. 11 f.

[163] Loc. cit.

[164] Ibid.

[165] Ibid.

[166] Supra, p. 12.

[167] According to Leo Honor, op. cit., p. 85.

manner, Kent regards 5a, b, c, plus 7-8 as due to a post-Exilic scribe.[168]

Box, Skinner, and Wade view verses 1-8 as a genuine oracle which contains a pronouncement of doom upon both Assyria and Jerusalem. Box[169] admits that there is an inconsistency, which he resolves by means of a proper understanding of the eschatological language. Wade meets the difficulty by saying:

> . . . But in reality the passage seems to correspond with Isaiah's actual anticipation concerning Jerusalem, which he expected to be brought to the verge of destruction and then preserved by the direct intervention of the Lord, . . .[170]

Similar to Wade's view is that of Skinner who feels that the passage (5-8):

> . . . reflects the tension in Isaiah's mind at one period of his career,--the conflict between a "fearful looking for a judgement" even to the uttermost, and the assurance of ultimate salvation of what was good in Israel . . .[171]

According to Leo Honor, "most scholars can not accept Skinner's conclusion, because they can not accept his premise."[172]

---

[168] C. F. Kent, op. cit., p. 130.

[169] G. H. Box, op. cit., pp. 130 f.

[170] G. W. Wade, op. cit., p. 186.

[171] J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 232.

[172] Leo L. Honor, op. cit., pp. 84; 111, footnote 16.

Whitehouse and Duhm are among those who hold the view that verses 5-8 are an independent oracle. Whitehouse, however, conservative as he is, regards them as the work of an editor,[173] while Duhm, eventually is led to give up their genuineness.[174] Fullerton and Pfeiffer also reject the verses.[175]

H. 30:27-33. This anti-Assyrian oracle, it may be recalled, is the one retained by Duhm in the third edition of his commentary, after he had given up the genuineness of 29:5-8, and 31:9.[176] Even so, however, he regards it as being for the believers, and as more a poem than a speech.[177] In general, there are three views held relative to the verses. The first takes them to be genuine, beyond doubt. To the group which holds to this view belong Duhm, as noted already, Wade,[178] and Whitehouse, who feels that the verses "clearly reveal all the strength and vividness as well as rhythm of the great Master."[179]

A second group of scholars are not positive in their

---

[173] See above, p. 11.

[174] Ibid.

[175] See K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," pp. 44 ff., and R. H. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 420.

[176] K. Fullerton, Ibid, pp. 46 f., footnote 100.

[177] B. Duhm, op. cit., p. 201.

[178] G. W. Wade, op. cit., pp. 198 f.

[179] O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 321.

opinion. Here belong Box,[180] who regards the oracle as doubtfully Isaiah's; McFadyen,[181] who says that it probably expresses the hopes of a much later age; and Skinner,[182] who wavers between viewing it as addressed to his [Isaiah's] disciples, and as the work of a disciple.

Another group of scholars holds to a third view, namely, that the verses are non-Isaianic. Among these are Cheyne,[183] Fullerton,[184] Pfeiffer,[185] Smend, Hackmann, and Marti.[186]

I. 31:1-9. This passage, which is much like 29:1-8 in both content and structure, presents much the same problems, but with at least one additional. Whereas the former permits of three possible divisions, this one permits generally of four or more: 1-9; 1-3, 4-9; 1-3, 4, 5-9; and 1-4, 5-9. Moreover, upon any one of these divisions, verses 4-9 permit of the very opposites in interpretation:

---

[180] G. H. Box, op. cit., p. 143.

[181] J. E. McFadyen, op. cit., p. 200.

[182] J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 248.

[183] T. K. Cheyne, op. cit., pp. 199 ff.

[184] K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," pp. 44 ff.

[185] R. H. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 440.

[186] These latter three scholars are included on the authority of E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 336.

they may be anti-Assyrian and thus pro-Judean, or they may be anti-Judean and hence pro-Assyrian. Verse 4, in most cases, serves as the key verse for both anti-Assyrian and anti-Judean interpretations, although it may be neutral.

Among those who view 1-9 as a unity are Kissane,[187] and apparently Whitehouse.[188] In the case of this division, the oracle is regarded as both anti-Judean and anti-Assyrian. To the group who choose the division 1-3, 4-9 belong Duhm, Marti, Mitchell, Pfeiffer, and Skinner. The group, however, is divided into two camps. On one side are those who view verses 4-9 as anti-Assyrian: Duhm,[189] and Skinner.[190] On the other side are those who regard 4-9 as unauthentic, and hence, not as anti-Assyrian: Marti,[191] Pfeiffer[192] and possibly Mitchell.[193]

The division 1-3, 4, 5-9 permits verse 4 to be

---

[187] Ibid, p. 350.

[188] O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., pp. 324 ff.

[189] B. Duhm, op. cit., pp. 205 f. According to Duhm, "verses 4, 5, 8, 9 contain the promise of Jerusalem's defence and Assyria's annihilation through Jahves' personal intervention."

[190] J. Skinner, op. cit., pp. 251 ff.

[191] According to O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 327.

[192] R. H. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 436.

[193] See H. G. Mitchell, "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," J. B. L. XXXVII (1918), 161.

"either or", or of no import. Box[194] seems to belong to a group who, regardless of the interpretation given to verse 4, view 5-9 as anti-Assyrian. It may be that he stands alone.

Those who make the division 1-4, 5-9 generally view the first portion as anti-Judean and the second as unauthentic. To this group belong Buttenwieser,[195] Cheyne,[196] Hackmann,[197] Kent,[198] and McFadyen.[199] Wade,[200] who belongs also to this group, views 1-4 as anti-Judean, and 5-9 as anti-Assyrian.

J. Chapter 32. As noted previously,[201] Whitehouse states that the opinions of recent critics, from Kuenen to Marti (1900), have with increasing unanimity pronounced

---

[194] G. H. Box, op. cit., pp. 137 ff.

[195] M. Buttenwieser, op. cit., pp. 266, 283 ff.

[196] T. K. Cheyne, op. cit., pp. 202 ff.

[197] So O. C. Whitehouse, loc. cit. See also, H. Hackmann, Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1893), p. 102.

[198] C. F. Kent, op. cit., p. 133. Kent regards 1-4 as genuine, but he does not give any consideration to verses 5-9.

[199] J. E. McFadyen, op. cit., p. 205. See especially the introduction to his commentary, pp. 14 f.

[200] G. W. Wade, op. cit., pp. 201 ff.

[201] Supra, p. 13.

against the Isaianic authorship of any portion of this chapter--Duhm being the notable exception. Whitehouse inclines towards Duhm's contention, but adds that "the composition of the great master has been touched here and there by later disciples."[202]

According to Kissane,[203] who is more conservative than even Duhm with regard to this chapter, there is no clear reference to the overthrow of Assyria. "It is concerned solely with Judah."

K. Chapter 33. Ewald, writing about this chapter as a whole, states:

> Whether Isaiah wrote this poem is very doubtful: though many words and the whole spirit recall Isaiah, the style is different, and many of the figures are foreign to Isaiah . . . The most probable supposition then appears to be that it was written by a pupil of Isaiah, and added later as an appendix to his Fifth Book.[204]

Many years later, McFadyen gives a picture of the impact of Ewald's observation upon biblical scholars. He writes, "With increasing confidence this chapter is being relegated, on the strength of its language and its thought, to the postexilic period . . ."[205]

As far as the general mass of scholars is concerned,

---

[202] O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 329.

[203] E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 357.

[204] H. Ewald, op. cit., p. 130.

[205] J. E. McFadyen, op. cit., p. 211.

the more conservative attribute the chapter to a disciple of Isaiah, or to a working up of Isaianic material by a later writer. The less conservative scholars pronounce it to be post-Exilic.[206]

It is interesting to note the comment of such a critic as Kissane concerning the broken "covenant" stressed so greatly by Driver,[207] and others, in their interpretation of this chapter:

> The covenant which has been made void is that by which Israel was made the chosen people, which seemed to have been made void by rejection of the people at the exile.[208]

L. Isaiah 37:6-7; 21-35 (II Kings 19:6-7; 20-34). Within the larger section, Isaiah, chapters 36-39 = II Kings 18:13-20:19 (minus 18:14-16) there are instances of one or more anti-Assyrian oracles, attributed by some to Isaiah. After giving a presentation of the problem, and summary of criticism, Meinhold[209] points out what soon be-

---

[206] See J. Skinner, op. cit., pp. 262 f.

[207] S. R. Driver, op. cit., pp. 77, footnote 1; R. H. Kennett, op. cit., pp. 19-20; James Frederick McCurdy, History, Prophecy and the Monuments (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911), p. 291, footnote; etc.

[208] E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 369.

[209] J. Meinhold, Die Jesajaerzählungen-Jesaja 36-39, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1898), pp. 1 ff.

comes obvious to any investigator--that there is a difference of judgment concerning the genuineness of the oracles. He continues:

> . . . In contrast to Gesenius and Hitzig, who hold fast to the authenticity of the speech of Isaiah 37:22-35; to Ewald, who is of the opinion that this section presents a speech of Isaiah written down by a listener and to Dillmann, who here finds Isaianic material, as also to Klostermann, who recognizes an Isaianic poem in Isaiah 37:22-29, others (thus Stade, a. a. O. S. 179; Duhm, a. a. O. S. 246; Cheyne, Introduction to the Book of Isaiah, S. 221 f.) have claimed not merely the report but also the poem contained in it as a later bungling piece of work.[210]

A brief investigation soon discovers a great number who, in addition to those mentioned by Meinhold, accept all or some of the oracles as genuine. It should be noted that Ewald,[211] already mentioned, regards verses 22-35 as Isaiah's last words against the Assyrian corrected by II Kings 19:21-34. To him the passage appears as no doubt genuine, but not committed to writing by the prophet himself. It was only later taken into the Book of Kings according to the recollection of his contemporaries. In his Isaiah: His Life and Times, Driver[212] regards verses 7, 29, 33, and 34 as

---

[210] Ibid., pp. 3 f.

[211] H. Ewald, op. cit., p. 134.

[212] S. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 83.

the prophet's last utterances; and in his Introduction,[213] he claims that II Kings 19:21-31 are unquestionably Isaiah's. Giesebrecht[214] is closely akin to Driver in his views relative to verses 22b-31. He places them in the time of distress at Assyria's hands under Hezekiah, and states:

> . . . To doubt the genuineness of this later passage (chapter 37) appears to me all too bold, it is most highly original, full of drastic pictures, a proof that a later [one] has not contrived the 30th verse. I entertain doubt only as concerns v. 32 on account of its agreement with Obad. v. 17.

Others[215] who join in attributing some, if not all, of the oracles to Isaiah are Box, Cornill, Kellner,[216] Skinner, Louise P. Smith,[217] W. R. Smith,[218] Wade,[219]

---

[213] An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (New Edition, Revised; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913; 1914), p. 197.

[214] F. Giesebrecht, Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verlag, 1890), pp. 95 ff.

[215] Here belong, also, the significant number of scholars who hold to a second campaign for Sennacherib. One of their reasons for postulating a second campaign seems to be that they regard the oracles as genuine but not as pertinent to 701.

[216] Along with Cheyne and Driver, M. L. Kellner, op. cit., p. 13, lists Cornill's view, and his own.

[217] Louise P. Smith, op. cit., p. 189.

[218] W. R. Smith, op. cit., pp. 345 ff., particularly, 349-352.

[219] G. W. Wade, op. cit., pp. 224 ff.

Whitehouse, and Wilke.[220] Box, Whitehouse, and Skinner, however, are not too positive in their estimates. According to Box:

> In view of the late date at which the two narratives were compiled "naturally," to use Cornill's words, "small security exists for the authenticity of the oracles of Isaiah preserved" in them. At the same time it is not necessary to suppose that Isaiah's attitude during the crisis so vividly portrayed is seriously misrepresented in them.[221]

Still further, with reference to 37:22-29 and 30-32, Box notes that in the first passage, verses 22-29, there are features which make its Isaianic character more than doubtful. The phraseology, he continues, is marked by un-Isaianic features. Yet, he goes on to say:

> At the same time there are points of contact with Isaiah, and it is not improbable that a certain amount of genuine Isaianic material has been embodied in both compositions.

Summoning Kittel and Kuenen to his support, Whitehouse states, "It is not improbable that verses 22-32 contain considerable portions of genuine Isaianic matter."[222] And, content with only verses 33-35, Skinner[223] views 22-29 as an elaboration of the theme of verses 6, 7 or 33-35, composed not by Isaiah himself but probably by a younger

---

[220] F. Wilke, op. cit., p. 5.

[221] G. H. Box, op. cit., pp. 159 ff.

[222] O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 361.

[223] J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 278.

disciple. With respect to the two verses which he holds to be genuine, he says:

> . . . A terse and pregnant oracle, such as we have in vv. 33-35 suits the situation better, and since these verses contain a complete and direct answer to the prayer of Hezekiah, we need not hesitate to regard them as the actual message of the prophet on this occasion.[224]

Despite the large number of scholars who hold to the genuineness of one or more of these oracles, most modern critics, if the accuracy of H. G. Mitchell can be depended upon, regard both 37:22 ff., and 33 ff. as *oracula ex eventu*, in agreement with the opinion of Beer. Mitchell, who seems to be rather neutral himself, has the following to say:

> Beer finds 37:22 ff., 33 ff., *oracula ex eventu*, and most scholars would endorse this opinion, not, however, because they do not agree with genuine utterance of an earlier date, but because as is shown by language and content, chs. 36 f. consist of two distinct variations on 2 Kgs. 18:14-16 which agree neither with it nor with each other, and 37:22-32 and 33-36 are duplicate sections in the later of these two narratives. . . .[225]

One who does regard the oracles as out of harmony with earlier utterances of the prophet is McFadyen[226] who,

---

[224] *Ibid.*, p. 288.

[225] H. G. Mitchell, "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," *J. B. L.* XXXVII (1918), 157.

[226] J. E. McFadyen, *op. cit.*, pp. 236 ff.

with reference to verses 33-35, notes that God [Yahweh] answers through Isaiah in response to Hezekiah's prayer that there is to be no siege of the city whereas elsewhere and earlier Isaiah had announced a very grievous siege. Two outstanding champions against authenticity who capitalize on the second item mentioned by Mitchell, language and content, are Cheyne[227] and Meinhold.[228] The arguments of these two scholars run along the same line. Cheyne begins the really stinging bit of his criticism by following in the steps of Stade[229] who first gave a clear presentation of the case. Stade (followed by Cheyne) calls attention to the threefold threat to Sennacherib in verses 7, 29, and 34. From this, Cheyne goes on to show that there are two distinct narratives of the conduct of Isaiah and Hezekiah during Sennacherib's invasion: 36:1-37;9a, 37, 38, and 37:9b-36. Chapters 38-39, in some form, were originally connected with one of them.[230] In chapter 37, Cheyne recognizes as glosses or

---

[227] T. K. Cheyne, op. cit.

[228] J. Meinhold, op. cit.

[229] K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," p. 20, credits Stade with having first subjected the Isaiah narratives to a rigorous criticism. Before him, however, Cheyne, op. cit., p. 214, had already credited Stade with the first clear exposition of the case.

[230] T. K. Cheyne, op. cit., pp. 214 f.

editorial insertions: verses 4, 6, 8, 22-29, 30-32, and 34. Verse 4 is copied from verse 17.[231] As for verses 22-29 and 30-32:

> This passage consists of a poetic oracle on Sennacherib, and a prophecy in plainer language addressed to Hezekiah. That it is an insertion cannot be shown beyond contradiction, and will always appear improbable to those who hold that it is the work of Isaiah. It will be admitted, however, that apart from other considerations, the form of xxxvii. 21-22a is favorable to the view that vv. 22b-32 are an addition to the narrative.
> . . . . . .
> . . . Nor is it impossible that he (the editor) added the prophecy in vv. 30-32, which is in a different rhythm from the poem, and addressed not to Sennacherib but (like v. 21b) to Hezekiah. . . .[232]

Then, with regard to the remaining verses in the chapter, Cheyne states:

> If xxxvii. 33, 35, 36 belongs to the second narrative, and vv. 37, 38 to the first, it is clear that v. 34, which agrees with vv. 7, 37, 38, but contradicts v. 36, must be a later insertion, designed to link the different parts of the story together. . . .[233]

Turning from this detailed analysis of the component parts of the chapters, Cheyne then centers his attention upon the dates of the parts--what is most important from the viewpoint of authenticity. First, five arguments are advanced against Isaiah's authorship of verses 22-29:[234]

> (1) The passage is in direct contradiction to a memorable prophecy (xxii. 1-14) which was most certain-

---

[231] Ibid., pp. 216 ff.

[232] Ibid., p. 219.

[233] Ibid., pp. 219 ff.

[234] Ibid., pp. 221 ff.

> ly delivered at the supposed period of this poetic oracle. During the blockade of Jerusalem Isaiah did not, so far as we can gather, consider his people worthy of encouragement, nor did he regard the retirement of the Assyrians as either ignominious or final. . . . (2)There is no parallel in the age of classical prophecy for such an artifically constructed oracle at the height of a great national crisis.
> . . . . . ; . . . . . .
> (3) The writer of v. 25 imputes to the Assyrian king, and virtually expresses on his own accout, a contempt for the power of Egypt which cannot, at the real or supposed date of the oracle, have been felt.
> . . . . . .
> (4) According to v. 26, Sennacherib ought to have known that Yahwè had long ago predicted the success of Assyria, whose king was but an instrument in the carrying out of Yahwè's purposes. This goes much beyond that great prophecy of Isaiah (x. 5-7, 13-14) which seems to have been in the mind of the writer, and it implies the characteristic late idea that Yahwè has given laws and instructions to the nations, . . .
> . . . . . .
> (5) The style is choicer than we should expect in Isaiah, but the argument from phraseology is so strong that we need not dwell upon this point. . . .

With these five arguments (here in abbreviated form) before him, Cheyne concludes that the first narrative, 36:1-37:9a, was written long after the time of the events described. "In xxxvii. 16-20 the conscious monotheism is certainly that of Deuteronomy and the second Isaiah."[235] The second narrative, including chapters 38-39, is most probably post-Exilic.[236]

Concerning 37:9b-36, which he designates B.[3],

---

[235] Ibid., p. 228.

[236] Ibid., p. 229.

Meinhold[237] maintains that, "Neither the speech of Sennacherib nor that of Hezekiah, finally also not that of Isaiah is conceivable out of the preexilic time." Again, he asserts, "But also the speech of the prophet is the speech of a later man, not to be set before the Exile."

Furthermore, in discussing Isaiah's attitude towards Jerusalem, Meinhold declares:

> . . . At no time had it come into Isaiah's mind to say, Jahve will for his own sake and for the sake of his servant David protect and preserve Jerusalem. Had not Isaiah even as Amos spoken of the destruction of Jerusalem, which Jahve for his own sake and the sake of his honor must accomplish? The notion that God's name could suffer through the fall of Jerusalem lay quite far from the greatness of a prophet of the stamp of Amos and Isaiah; much more would it be exalted through it, because Jerusalem's downfall would prove that Jahve, the God of righteousness, also punished his people and did not overlook Israel's sins. If Jahve also had his temple in Jerusalem, so was he indeed not bound to the city. Not till after the fall of Samaria, after that Jerusalem had been freed from her surpassing competitors Bethel, Dan, Gilgal, etc.; further, only after the reform of Josiah had done away with all other places of worship and Jerusalem actually had been made the only seat of Jahve on earth, were so to speak Jahve's honor and Jahve's dwelling-place bound to Jerusalem. Therefore also here we stand on the ground prepared by Deuteronomy.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Thus lead therefore linguistic and objective observations into the time after 622. Indeed, the relationship of ideas, of the theological interests, between B.[3] and Deutero-Isaiah suits rather the exilic than the close preexilic period, if also not necessary dependance on Deutero-Isaiah and therewith later origin were given.[238]

---

[237] J. Meinhold, op. cit., pp. 30 ff.

[238] Ibid.

In addition to the arguments against authenticity set forth by Cheyne and Meinhold are those of equally great scholars: Beer, Duhm, Fullerton, Hackmann, Pfeiffer, J. M. P. Smith, Stade, and others, whose judgments time will not permit of discussion.

III MESSIANIC AND RELATED PROPHECIES

Within the first thirty-nine chapters of the book of Isaiah there are several prophecies which either mention or seem to imply a Messianic figure or a Messianic age; or both; and others which give hints at a future time in non-Messianic terms. By many scholars, at least some of these prophecies have been regarded as Isaiah's picturization of the future for his people, more particularly the remnant, however it might be defined, in the time immediately after the overthrow of the Assyrians. In fact, Louise P. Smith speaks for a large number when she says with reference to certain of these prophecies:

> Without the Messianic passages, the thought of Isaiah is incomplete. The destruction which he prpphesied was not final, since the account of his prophecy that the city of Jerusalem should remain untaken must have some basis in fact, and some of the passages which predict the punishment of Assyria are evidently genuine. The Messianic passages are the natural consequence of the fulfillment of these expectations.[239]

On the other hand, there are those who reject all the future-

---

[239] Louise P. Smith, op. cit., pp. 211 ff.

predicting or picturing oracles, or at least the Messianic ones. For the purpose of this dissertation the following passages are to be considered: 2:2-4; 4:2-6; 9:1-6(2-7); 11:1-9, and 1:21-26. The first four of these are regarded as more or less Messianic, while the last is no longer regarded as having Messianic significance.[240]

A. 2:2-4. According to Whitehouse,[241] most modern scholars regard this oracle as post-Exilic. In the following cross-section of opinion the views of critics of all shades may be seen: those of the neo-critical school in both its early and late phases together with that of at least one offshoot from that school, Duhm; the view of the archaeological school, and even that of traditionally

---

[240] According to Louise P. Smith, op. cit., p. 163, and K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," p. 9, 1:21-26 is not strictly Messianic. In "Viewpoints," also, p. 26, Kemper Fullerton, following Duhm, confirms Louise Smith, op. cit., pp. 159, 197, in viewing 7:10-25 and 8:5-8, 10 as not having any Messianic significance. In the same category Louise Smith places 4:2 ff. The specifically Messianic interpretation of 32:1 ff., and 33:17 is now generally given up, according to K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," p. 7, footnote 6. In addition to the foregoing sections which are impertinent to a discussion of Messianic passages in Isaiah, are: 11:11-12:6; chapters 24-27; 35, which are according to Louise Smith, op. cit., pp. 158 f., "unhesitatingly assigned by modern scholars to a period during or after the exile-- . . .", and, 2:2-4; 4:2-6; 17:12-14; 28: 5, 6; 29:17-24; 30: 18-30; 32:15-20; 33:13-24 probably belong to the same period.

[241] O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 98. Whitehouse gives a very detailed and complete presentation of scholarly opinion through the years.

orthodox scholars.[242]

Box,[243] who perhaps in this instance represents the views of the archaeological school, claims that there is nothing improbable in supposing that Isaiah is here citing an older poem. Cheyne[244] regards the passage as having been taken from Micah, and as the work of a post-Exilic imitator of the older prophets. Support is given to Cheyne's view by Gray[245] who thinks of it as the work of editors who placed it in both books. Others who definitely regard the passage as ungenuine are: Hackmann, Mitchell, Pfeiffer, Louise P. Smith, and Wade. McFadyen[246] thinks that it is most probably a later insertion. Kissane[247] accepts it as authentic and dates it before 735, while Duhm, [248] who ac-

---

[242] For the meaning of these terms except the last, the reader is directed to K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," p. 2, footnotes 2, and 3. The last term is here used of those critics who either preceded Wellhausen, or, who regard the book of Isaiah as a unity, that is, at least the first thirty-nine chapters.

[243] G. H. Box, op. cit., p. 31.

[244] T. K. Cheyne, op. cit., p. 14.

[245] G. B. Gray, op. cit., p. 43.

[246] J. E. McFadyen, op. cit., p. 37.

[247] E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 22.

[248] B. Duhm, op. cit., p. 15.

cepts it also, places it late in the prophet's life, viewing it as his swan-song. Procksch[249] and Whitehouse agree with Duhm in his dating of the oracle, whereas Skinner,[250] who accepts it along with Box (?), Kissane, Duhm, Procksch, and Whitehouse, finds it difficult to assign it to any definite period in the prophet's career.

B. 4:2-6. Driver and Kissane unite in accepting all four verses as authentic, while most of those who view any part of the oracle as genuine limit the verses to 2-4, or 2-5b. Stade,[251] by rearranging the verses in the order: 4, 2, 3, accepts 2-4. Dillmann, Condamin, and Whitehouse reject verses 5c-6.[252] Skinner[253] agrees with these three latter scholars, but he regards the passage as being no part of Isaiah's spoken message in the time of Ahaz. Box[254] feels that the section 2-4 may be an eschatological one used by Isaiah, but hardly to be imputed to the prophet's

---

[249] Procksch is included on the authority of E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 21.

[250] J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 15.

[251] So G. B. Gray, op. cit., p. 77. Cheyne (op. cit., p. 20), and Duhm (op. cit., p. 30), however, list Stade's order as: 4, 3, 2.

[252] So G. B. Gray, loc. cit.

[253] J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 31.

[254] G. H. Box, op. cit., p. 39.

authorship. Cheyne, Duhm, Hackmann, Kent, and Pfeiffer reject Isaiah's authorship, and likewise his use of the oracle.

C. 9:1-6(2-7). This section has received some consideration already under the heading of an anti-Assyrian oracle, to which place the present writer assigned it, following Wilke,[255] because of the reference to the oppressor's rod as having been broken. Under the present heading a more thorough presentation is afforded.

Kemper Fullerton[256] notes that a majority of scholars favor the picture of the Messianic King presented in this oracle, and in chapter 11:1 ff. It should be noted too that those who do accept it as genuine assign it to two different periods in the prophet's career: some select the time around 735; others prefer the period around 701. It appears that most of those who do accept it agree with Duhm who puts it, along with 2:2-4, 11:1 ff., and 32:1-8, in the last years of the prophet's life. In addition to Box, Driver, Duhm, Mitchell, Kissane, Skinner, and Louise P. Smith, noted previously as accepting the passage as

---

[255] F. Wilke, op. cit., pp. 75 ff.

[256] K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," p. 7.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

genuine, are Budde,[257] Gordon,[258] T. H. Robinson, and Whitehouse. Half way between accepting and rejecting it as Isaianic stand Cheyne and Gray. Definitely opposed to authenticity are Fullerton, Hackmann, Marti, Pfeiffer, J. M. P. Smith, and Stade.

If Isaiah's, Cheyne[259] would put it in the reign of Ahaz, although he is inclined more to place it with Hackmann and Marti in a post-Exilic period. As noted previously,[260] Mitchell assigns it to the reign of Ahaz, and views it as being only for the prophet's disciples. Later on, in his life, he places it in 701, noting that a gloomy period had already intervened.[261] This gloomy period he later regards as related to the events of Sennacherib's invasion. As noted previously also,[262] Kissane places the oracle in the

---

257 K. Budde, Religion of Israel to the Exile (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899), p. 147, footnote, views 6:1-9:6 as a book in itself, "written down by the prophet for the more intimate circle of his disciples." See also p. 153.

258 Alex. R. Gordon, The Faith of Isaiah Statesman and Evangelist (London, James Clark & Co., 1919), pp. 109 ff.

259 T. K. Cheyne, op. cit., p. 44.

260 Supra, p. 15.

261 H. G. Mitchell, "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," p. 162.

262 Supra, p. 15.

time of Ahaz, but he refers it to the northern kingdom, linking it with chapter 8:16 ff.; and Skinner dates it 734-733. Duhm[263] and Hackmann,[264] however, show that the prophecy can not belong to the earlier period. Agreeing with Mitchell in his later stage, and viewing the oracle as being for the prophet's disciples are: Budde, Duhm, Whitehouse, Louise P. Smith, T. H. Robinson, and Wade.

D. 11:1-9. Here, as in the case of 9:1-6(2-7), according to Fullerton, most scholars favor Isaiah's authorship. The passage is of utmost importance in determining the prophet's attitude toward the future of Judah because it especially has been regarded traditionally as the sequel to the overthrow of the Assyrian armies in Judah. As in the case of 9:1-6(2-7), again, those who accept it as genuine are divided as to the period in the prophet's life to which it should be assigned. Kissane and Mitchell refer it to the time of Ahaz. Duhm claims that it deserves the same remarks as 2:2-4, and places it in the prophet's old

---

263 B. Duhm, op. cit., p. 66, states that the soldiery referred to in verse 4 can only be the army of Sennacherib.

264 H. Hackmann, op. cit., pp. 135 ff., points out that the oracle can not belong to the period 701, as Duhm maintains, nor (p. 143) to the time of Ahaz--nor to any period in the prophet's life time. The conclusion to his argument appears on page 145.

age, after he had come to know Manasseh.[265] Louise P. Smith[266] follows closely after Duhm in her opinion. Similarly, Whitehouse assigns it to the close of Isaiah's life, after the withdrawal of Sennacherib's army in 701; as does Barton who says, "The foolishness of Hezekiah and the ruthlessness of Sennacherib had turned the prophet's thoughts again to the ideal social state."[267] Skinner is tossed between the time of Ahaz and 701, but finally takes hold on the latter date. To Gray the passage is more probably Exilic or post-Exilic. Wade also seems inclined to reject the oracle as Isaiah's. Budde, who accepts 9:1-6(2-7), but rejects this passage, elicits the following comment from J. M. P. Smith:

> . . . Furthermore, to claim Isa. 9:1-6 for Isaiah and to deny Isaiah's authorship of Chapter 11, as Budde does, is inconsistent in the highest degree. If Isaiah could have produced the one, he could without difficulty have produced the other. What rules chapter 11 out of the category of Isaiah's utterances works with equal effectiveness to exclude Isa. 9:1-6.[268]

---

[265] B. Duhm, op. cit., p. 81.

[266] L. P. Smith, op. cit., p. 191. She views the oracle, however, as beginning with 10:33 and ending with 11:10 (pp. 168 ff.). Somewhat like her arrangement is that of Kissane who, op. cit., pp. 132 ff., makes a continuous prophecy of 10:27d-11, dating the whole in 734.

[267] G. A. Barton, The Religion of Israel (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1918), pp. 108 ff.

[268] J. M. P. Smith, op. cit., p. 253.

Gordon,[269] like Budde, rejects 11:1-9 but holds firmly to 9:1-6(2-7). Cheyne, Fullerton, Hackmann, and Pfeiffer join Gray, Wade, Budde, Gordon, and J. M. P. Smith in affirming the ungenuineness of the passage.

E. 1:21-26. This passage, which received some consideration as a pro-Assyrian oracle, calls for further treatment in connection with Isaiah's picture of the future. In regard to verses 24-27, Louise P. Smith[270] states that they are universally ascribed to the prophet, while Fullerton[271] notes that verses 21-26 contain no nationalism. As was noted previously,[272] Glazebrook, Kissane, Mitchell, and Skinner assign the passage to either the very earliest or early years of the prophet's career. To these scholars should be added Duhm,[273] who refers the verses to Isaiah's

---

[269] A. R. Gordon, op. cit., p. 113, footnote.

[270] L. P. Smith, op. cit., p. 160. This is an inaccurate statement. Verse 27, along with 28, is generally assigned to a post-Exilic date (Cf. supra, p. 5). She is wrong also (p. 181, footnote 46) in stating that Beer treats 1:24 ff. like the other Messianic passages. Verse 26 is used by Beer to show Isaiah's future expectation. (See succeeding sections of this study).

[271] K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," p. 38.

[272] Supra, pp. 5-6.

[273] B. Duhm, op. cit., p. 11.

early period--before the prophet's eschatological ideas had appeared, that is, before the crisis of 735-734. Cheyne and Kellner, who select 701 as the date, find support in Louise P. Smith[274] who places the passage after 701, in a time when the people needed comfort, and Hackmann who puts it in a later situation when the remnant is no longer Judah. Says Hackmann, "The honest will be left over, and their faithfulness to Jahve, their moral earnestness will permit the fallen city to blossom anew."[275]

IV. SUMMARY OF CRITICAL OPINION

The preceding investigation reveals the manner in which scholarship in general, and some specific individuals, regard the authenticity and date of the various passages studied. It offers the opportunity to see on which side a majority of scholars are arrayed, and permits the investigator to see what to him appear to be the most valid arguments. Further, it permits the investigator to view both, or all sides, objectively. The benefit to be derived does not connect with an acceptance or rejection of a passage merely because a majority of scholars decide one way or another, for the majority, as it in so many instances seems

---

[274] L. P. Smith, op. cit., p. 189.

[275] H. Hackmann, op. cit., pp. 117 ff.

to be, may conceivably be in error. Nor does the benefit derive from choosing one side over against another. It lies in the investigator's being enabled to make decisions for himself, which decisions may be off the main line of either, or all groups.

A. The anti-Judean-Jerusalem oracles. In the case of these oracles it is seen that scholars universally accept them to be genuine. Isaiah was, at least for a part of his career, a prophet of doom upon Judah, and even upon Jerusalem, the holy city, itself. Whatever difference of opinion manifests itself is on the matter of date. Generally speaking, two radically opposing views are set forth in this matter: 1, all these oracles belong to the earlier stages of the prophet's career, from 740 down to or shortly before 701, or, even in 701, in the very midst of events. Whatever exact period is chosen is used as a turning point in the attitude of the prophet towards Assyria, or towards Judah, or towards both. From this point on, the prophet was no longer a threatener with doom upon his people, or Judah-Jerusalem in particular, but on the contrary, a threatener with doom upon Assyria. Or, 2, the oracles are viewed as consistent with any and all stages of the prophet's activity. From this point of view Isaiah consistently predicted doom for his people from beginning to end--except

for a remnant; he never changed. This view also, however, permits of two different phases in the prophet's attitude, not towards his people, be they Judah, Jerusalem, or the remnant, but towards Assyria. Either all during the years, or at some particular time or times he did pronounce doom upon Assyria also, or he did never pronounce doom upon her (armies). This latter observation brings the investigation logically to the second group of passages, namely:

B. The anti-Assyrian oracles. With respect to these passages, although the matter of date is still important, the main issue hinges on whether or not they are genuinely Isaiah's. Here, too, opinion is divided, and more radically even than over the date of the anti-Judean prophecies. In the main, opinion may be seen along two different and distinct lines:

1. One group claims them to be positively authentic, and in keeping with the prophet's patriotism or particular brand of nationalistic feeling, which feeling permits of the prophet's change in his attitude towards Assyria, or towards Judah, or towards the remnant, or--a combination of all three. In some instances Isaiah is regarded as encouraging the people to resistance, in contradiction to his disparagement of physical might. This change is based upon one or more entities some of which to be noted are; a, a change in Assyria from fitness to unfitness as Yahweh's in-

strument of punishment upon his people; b, Assyria's overstepping of the bounds assigned to her by Yahweh; c, Assyria's boastfulness and pride; d, Assyria's ruthlessness; e, Assyria's blasphemy against Yahweh's majesty, or Assyria's sacrilege with regard to the "holy city" or the temple, or both of these crimes; f, Assyria's breaking of the covenant; g, a change on the part of Hezekiah from reliance upon material might, Egypt, horses and chariots, etc., to reliance upon Yahweh alone; h, repentance on the part of the people in conjunction with or apart from a change on the part of Hezekiah, in the face of disaster; i, a development of sympathy on the part of the prophet (the Hosea in him?) in the face of the suffering of his people, either before or during the blockade of Jerusalem; j, the prophet's decision that his people had suffered sufficiently, etc., etc. As is seen, the change may be due to Assyria, to the King or the people, or to the prophet. Any one scholar may concentrate on one or more of these reasons.

2. A second group denies authenticity of the passages, either wholly or in part, and views them as being out of harmony with Isaiah's prophetic nature which was super-nationalistic rather than more or less rabidly nationalistic. Isaiah is presented as consistent in his superpatriotism by at least, four different methods: a, the ideas presented in the generally accepted anti-Judean

oracles are contrasted with the ideas in the questionable anti-Assyrian oracles,--these latter, being out of harmony with the generally accepted ideas which are super-nationalistic, are rejected as foreign elements, and are relegated to periods when such nationalistic views were more or less common to the Jews; b, the particular anti-Assyrian oracles are limited in the extent to which they pronounce doom; c, the particular anti-Assyrian oracles are altered in meaning or eradicated by means of textual alteration; d, the particular anti-Assyrian oracles, if any, are viewed as not addressed to the populace but to the (remnant? which consists of the) prophet's disciples.

C. The Messianic and related oracles. As concerns this third group of oracles, scholars were found to be divided still again: first on the matter of date, and second, on the matter of authenticity. Here, also, one group accepts the oracles as genuine but disagrees as to date, while a second group, which is growing numerically, as should have been noted also in the case of the anti-Assyrian oracles, rejects the passages as non-Isaianic.

The grounds for rejection are manifold, but generally speaking they are: 1, the oracles wholly or in part rest upon the ungenuine, nationalistic, anti-Assyrian oracles for interpretation--the anti-Assyrian oracles, which picture the overthrow of the Assyrian armies as a prelude to a happy

future for the remnant, Judah, or the Jews; or 2, Isaiah was not interested in the future, particularly the immediate or remote future pictured in the eschatological and even apocalyptic Messianic oracles; his interest was limited or confined to his own day and generation; 3, for both of these reasons combined.

V. CONCLUSIONS

It is not within the province of this undertaking to decide upon the authenticity and date of each oracle or fragment of an oracle in the three different groups separately, but rather as a whole. In fact, such a procedure will be found to be sufficient. The universally accepted anti-Judean prophecies need to be considered only with respect to date. With the contrast of ideas between the genuine oracles and the anti-Assyrian ones as a starting point, a decision will be presented with regard to the latter. And, as for the Messianic oracles, judgment will be passed, based upon Isaiah's future expections and upon his eschatological-apocalyptic nature, or lack of it.

A. The dating of the anti-Judean oracles. It is necessary here only to point out that the anti-Judean oracles are not all to be dated in the earlier periods of the prophet's career--before a change had come over him. He

preached doom consistently to the end of his career,[276] or at least, even after the departure of the armies of Sennacherib from southern Palestine and the lower coastlands along the Mediterranean, for all except the remnant. Moreover, he expected the Assyrians to return[277] and to complete the work of destruction upon Jerusalem[278] which had not been fulfilled due to the withdrawal of the Assyrian forces (22:1-14). All but the remnant were to be destroyed; only the remnant was destined to survive.[279] Jerusalem was not identical with that remnant as many scholars have long since been aware, and as will be shown further in a suc-

---

[276] So, at least, G. Beer, "Zur Zukunftserwartung Jesajas," B. Z. Z. F. A. W. XXVII (Alfred Topelmann (Vormals J. Ricker), 1914), p. 23; J. M. P. Smith, op. cit., p. 254; K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," pp. 34 f., 47. See also H. Hackmann, op. cit., p. 171.

[277] Hackmann perceives this clearly, op. cit., p. 171, as does also Beer, op. cit., pp. 22 ff., and J. M. P. Smith, op. cit., p. 254.

[278] H. G. Mitchell admits of this much, "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," p. 156.

[279] This significance with respect to the remnant is admitted by scholars of all shades. See J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel (Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, MDCCCLXXXV), p. 485; W. R. Smith, op. cit., pp. 232 f., 247, 248, 252; E. J. Kissane, op. cit., p. 10; L. P. Smith, op. cit., p. 189; F. Giesebrecht, op. cit., p. 81; H. G. Mitchell, ibid., pp. 153 f., Elmer W. K. Mould, Essentials of Bible History (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1939), p. 327, G. Beer, op. cit., pp. 29 f.

ceeding section.

B. The authenticity and date of the anti-Assyrian oracles. The view taken by Stade and his followers,[280] that the anti-Assyrian oracles are non-Isaianic, is by far more objective and reasonable than that accepted or proposed by those who regard them to be genuine. The conclusions reached by Stade and those who share his views to a greater or lesser degree are arrived at by pushing the criterion of ideas to the front. In the method pursued, the oracles are viewed as not only out of harmony with their contexts, as not only expressing a universalism too exhalted for the eighth century B. C., but the ideas contained in them are regarded as being out of harmony with those expressed in the universally accepted anti-Judean oracles.

Another matter which tells decisively against the genuineness of the anti-Assyrian oracles is that of the reasons advanced by scholars for Isaiah's change in his attitude. Without exception, these reasons, sincere to be sure, are artificial constructions.[281]

---

[280] See K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," pp. 20 ff.

[281] For a monumental presentation of these constructions, see K. Fullerton, ibid., pp. 33 f., footnote 71.

The assumption that the prophet's attitude towards Assyria changed because Assyria changed for the bad borders on the ridiculous.[282] The question is never whether Assyria was once good or righteous in Isaiah's eyes, or that the prophet ever favored her over against his own people. In this sense Isaiah was never pro-Assyrian! Kemper Fullerton expresses Isaiah's position very accurately and aptly when he says:

> . . . But again it must be insisted upon that to call Isaiah pro-Assyrian is to interpret his activities from a purely political point of view, whereas they are to be judged by the religious motives that guided him. He was opposed to all intrigues with other nations against Assyria because these seemed to him to express a lack of faith in Yahweh. It was to Yahweh alone that the people must look for help in the agony of the Assyrian oppression. . . .[283]

Wilke is quite wrong in declaring that the policy of Assyria changed from one acceptable to Yahweh to one that was not, as a cause of the prophet's change. He is forced to put a very strained interpretation upon chapter 10 in order to prove his point.[284] Furthermore, Isaiah did not need to see the destruction of Judah in 701 before he could

---

[282] See F. Wilke, op. cit., pp. 112 ff. See also the inconsistency of H. G. Mitchell, ibid., pp. 155 f.

[283] K. Fullerton, "Isaiah's Attitude in the Sennacherib Campaign," A. J. S. L. L. XLII (1925) 24. See also p. 19.

[284] F. Wilke, loc. cit.

become aware of Assyrian methods.[285] The fall of the northern kingdom left no one in doubt on this point. It must always be realized that the northern and southern kingdoms were in very close proximity to each other.

Similarly, the other reasons advanced for a change in the prophet's attitude are equally untenable. Pride on the part of Assyria would be a logical prelude to her fall, not first after 705, but from the time that the prophet first conceived of the "Day of Yahweh" as being an occasion on which all lifted up in pride would be abased. Should Assyria show evidences of such a condition she too must go, as all else.

As for the argument, that Isaiah regarded Assyria as having overstepped her bounds when she thought to include Jerusalem in her conquests along with other cities,--it is based upon a false interpretation which assumes wrongly that Isaiah taught the inviolability of Jerusalem. Moreover, apart from 37:22 ff., the only presumably definitely dated oracle, it is improbable that Isaiah ever proclaimed such a doctrine in any sense. And the arguments of Cheyne, who accepts some of the anti-Assyrian oracles, against the

---

285 H. G. Mitchell, "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," p. 154, concedes at least this much.

authenticity of this passage, are convincing beyond refutation.[286]

In connection with the inviolability of Jerusalem, Fullerton makes a very objective observation which he concludes with two questions:

> But not only Jeremiah was opposed to the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, Isaiah's own contemporary, Micah, was also opposed to it. And it is important to notice that this doctrine was a popular doctrine in Micah's and Isaiah's day exactly as it was in Jeremiah's. Would Isaiah have been less true to his great prophetic convictions that Micah was? Would he have made concessions at this point to popular fanaticism that Micah sturdily refused to make?[287]

Fullerton leaves the answer to the judgment of the reader, and to be sure, some have attempted a reply.[288] The correct answer, however, is given by J. M. P. Smith:

> It is clear that Isaiah and Micah both anticipated the downfall of Jerusalem. This involved the end of Judah's independent nationality. How, then, could they think of the religion of Yahweh continuing after his nation had ceased to exist? It is clear that neither of these prophets ever for a moment thought of Yahweh as passing out of existence along with his nation. But a God with no worshippers was inconceivable to the Hebrew mind. How, then, could Yahweh's worship be continued? Two elements enter into the answer to this question. Micah, as a rustic, evidently did not identify the perpetuity of the nation with the continuous existence of Jerusalem . . . A second fact familiar to both Micah and Isaiah was the object-lesson constantly before their eyes across the northern border of Judah.

---

[286] See above, pp. 43 ff.

[287] K Fullerton, "Viewpoints," pp. 54 f.

[288] See Fullerton's statement loc. cit., footnote 118, relative to the answers of W. R. Smith and Smend.

> For twenty years Israel had ceased to be an independent government . . . But the religion of Yahweh had not gone out of existence there along with the government . . . In any case it was Yahweh-worship, and it remained so down to a much later time, and kept the books of the Pentateuch as its scripture. . . .[289]

Two other questions, though, still clamour for an answer, one having to do with the historical development of the Deuteronomic idea of centralization of worship; the other with the legend that grew up around Isaiah's having presumably predicted Jerusalem's deliverance from the Assyrians. Meinhold's contribution to the answer of the first has already been presented.[290] To it might be added that of Fullerton and others.[291] As for the second, Fullerton again supplies the answer:

> We have seen how there gradually grew up a very different judgment upon the events of 701 from the judgment of contemporaries. The bare escape of capital and temple from massacre and pillage became construed as a signal deliverance, wrought by Jahweh, himself. But Isaiah was the outstanding figure of that time. Was it possible for a prophet not to be aware of Jahweh's intentions to save the city, and, being aware of them, was it possible for him to keep silent? Once grant the development of the legend of deliverance, and it is an easy step to associate Isaiah with that deliverance and to suppose that he must have defied Assyria.[292]

---

[289] J. M. P. Smith, op. cit., pp. 255 f.

[290] Supra, p. 46.

[291] K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," pp. 59 f.

[292] Ibid., pp. 67 f.

Returning once more to the reasons advanced for a change in the prophet's attitude, the thought that Isaiah changed in his attitude toward Assyria because Sennacherib broke a covenant (33:8), made between him and Hezekiah, after the latter had rendered tribute (II Kings 18:14-16), is ruled out, not only due to the impossibility of identifying the "covenant",[293] but due to the fact that this entire chapter is regarded generally as spurious.[294]

There is not one grain of proof that Hezekiah and the people ever changed.[295] In fact, what evidence there is (1:5 ff.; 22:1-14) points to the contrary. Then, too, whatever reforms might be credited to Hezekiah were made not during or after 701 but in 705, when a change in religious policy would be part of the rebellion from Assyrian overlordship and vice versa[296]--a policy with which Isaiah could not have been in sympathy.[297]

That there was no change for the good on the part

---

[293] Remember Kissane's identification, supra, p. 36 See also the definition given by J. McCurdy, op. cit., p. 291.

[294] See above, pp. 37 f.

[295] Even Wilke admits this, op. cit., p. 105.

[296] Wilke agrees to this also, loc. cit.

[297] See Hackmann, op. cit., p. 169; In 705, "Da verliess Hiskia den Weg des Glaubens und betrat den Weg der Politik."

of the people is fully attested to by 22:1-14, which is generally accepted as genuine, and as an oracle of doom upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem. There is no justifiable reason for putting it very early as do Gesenius, Maurer, Movers and Knobel, in addition to those already noted,[298] nor moderately late in 705-704, as does Duhm;[299] nor still more moderately later as does Mitchell.[300] The indecision on the part of such scholars raises doubts in itself. But when one advances the reason given by Mitchell,[301] the fallacy is still more easily seen. This argument, that there were no oxen and sheep to slay in 701, presumes a far worse plight in Jerusalem than one is warranted to make, even with regard to 1:7-8. There are no pictures of starvation in the city, and Jerusalem, far more formidable a fortress than Samaria had been, was surely in a position to endure more than a blockade of brief duration.

That the threads of nationalistic sympathy would

---

[298] See Franz Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890), I, 93 f., and supra, p. 10.

[299] B. Duhm, op. cit., pp. 133 f.

[300] H. G. Mitchell, "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," p. 159.

[301] Ibid.

cause the prophet to alter a message of thirty-five years, and even encourage the people to active resistance against the Assyrians is to make of him a heretic, and cause him to abandon his central message of faith (7:9b; 30:15; 31:1 ff.).

The arguments of style, language and historical background,[302] the untenable reasons postulated for a change in Isaiah's attitude, in addition to the contrast of ideas, force the conclusion that the anti-Assyrian oracles are not authentic. They do not represent Isaiah's true nationalistic nature; neither do they provide a basis for assuming a change in his attitudes towards Assyria or Judah-Jerusalem. And, what is more, they nowhere connect with the historical background of Isaiah's day.

There does remain, however, an almost universally accepted oracle which is viewed as expressing an anti-Assyrian attitude on the part of the prophet (10:5-9, 13-14(15), together with a few genuine oracles of hope.[303] What about these? In the first place, 10:5-9, 13-14(15),

---

[302] See particularly Fullerton's reply to the archaeological school, "Viewpoints," pp. 71 ff.

[303] Hackmann, according to F. Wilke, op. cit., p. 104 regards this passage, however, as not having in it any comfort for Judah. Beer, of course, op. cit., p. 26, rejects even this portion of chapter 10 as ungenuine.

as H. G. Mitchell recognizes,[304] is not a full-fledged picture of the overthrow of Assyria, but a general statement, (which does not represent a change in the prophet's attitude), embodying his convictions from the very beginning of his career. Granted, however, that it was uttered in 701, even now the prophet, as Beer points out,[305] expected still further devastation at Assyria's hands, and expected whatever future there was to be as still under Assyrian suzerainty. And, indeed, Sennacherib's defeat was not so signal that Judah became free. Assyrian domination continued! In the second place, whatever oracles of hope that there might have been were pronounced not to and for the benefit of the leaders or the people, but to and for the remnant, which consisted of the believing ones--the prophet's disciples.[306] As for the Judeans outside

---

[304] H. G. Mitchell, "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," pp. 159 f.

[305] G. Beer, op. cit., p. 23. Unfortunately, even Pfeiffer gets caught in the trap of "a change" in Isaiah's attitude towards Assyria, op. cit., p. 436, with regard to this passage.

[306] Even Fullerton, who does not favor the idea of Isaiah's having addressed oracles to his disciples, ("Viewpoints," p. 35) agrees, versus Louise P. Smith (op. cit., p. 191) that this might be all right in this instance, ibid., pp. 38 f., footnote, but especially, p. 49, footnote 108. W. R. Smith, also, agrees in this instance. He makes chapter 10 a word of comfort to the true remnant--Isaiah's own circle: op. cit., p. 433, note 10, to page 298.

Jerusalem, in the country districts, still in the land, Isaiah had no immediate concern.[307] They did not come into the immediate range of his consideration just as every being does not come into the immediate sphere of interest of even the greatest pastor. This is not narrowness; it is concentration upon one's immediate object or objects of care, which had been, except in a few instances, so far as is known, the prophet's one great task ever since he had received the commission to: "Bind thou up the testimony, seal the law (teaching) among my disciples (8:16)."

All things considered, the question of date for any particular anti-Assyrian oracle (10:5 ff.) and for any message of comfort recedes into the background when they are referred properly to the remnant[308]--the believers who

---

[307] In his "Isaiah 14:28-32," A. J. S. L. L. XLII (1926), K. Fullerton shows that this particular passage cannot be genuine. Although he may not be justified in emending the text to suit his view, the old criterion of ideas works here as elsewhere. That Isaiah would not include the "poor and afflicted" in the remnant just because of their physical lot is quite evident from his ethical and religious nature. Both H. Dittmann, "Der heilige Rest im Alten Testament," Theologische Studien und Kritiken (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes A. G., 1914), and Louise P. Smith, op. cit., include them wrongly: Dittmann because he accepts the passage as genuine; Miss Smith, more because she recognizes that many outside Jerusalem will remain over from the destruction.

[308] This is proved further by the fact that many have dated 10:5 ff. in every period conceivable. See above, p. 22, footnote 113.

gathered around Isaiah, and who like him exercised faith in Yahweh.[309]

The preceding discussion of the anti-Assyrian oracles: their lack of authenticity, except in the case of 10:5 ff., and its being addressed only to the prophet's disciples; and the date as being comformable to various periods in Isaiah's career, leads to a consideration of Isaiah's future expectations, inasmuch as these have been connected with the pictures of the destruction of the Assyrian armies on the one hand, and with the remnant on the other.

C. The Messianic and related oracles. Insofar as any of the future expectations of Isaiah are based upon a connection with the overthrow of the Assyrian armies, they are, as has been seen, to be discarded. This leaves for consideration, however, possible oracles which may not be interpreted in a nationalistic light. What about them? The investigator has concluded that both the neo-critical school in its original phase and Duhm, on the one hand, have gone too far, while the eschatological school and the neo-critical school as represented by Fullerton have gone too far also, on the other.

---

[309] That these constituted the remnant is admitted, again, by scholars of all shades: Duhm, Dittmann, Fullerton, W. R. Smith, etc.

1. The Messianic oracles. The neo-critical school in its original phase along with those who still hold to its views are shown to be wrong in their using the anti-Assyrian oracles to mark the dividing line between the old age and the new era of the Messiah.[310] In addition, they have no right to assume that Isaiah was interested exclusively in the ethical and spiritual, and that he was strictly a prophet for his own day and generation.[311] The matter is not whether Isaiah was either wholly apocalyptic or not, but, as in the case of Jesus, and all others who believe in God "both and." Duhm is equally wrong in viewing Isaiah as entirely apocalyptic and theological in nature, and in assuming that the Messianic oracles must be pushed into the "swan-song" period of the prophet's life, and regarded, in addition, as poetic fancies written for, or even addressed to the disciples. To make of the Messianic oracles imaginary pictures of an ideal future is to remove them altogether from a consideration of Isaiah's philosophy of history, for this philosophy is based upon Isaiah's views of the relation of Yahweh to the real features of history.

---

[310] For this and the following discussions, see K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints."

[311] M. Buttenwieser, op. cit., goes to the opposite extreme in viewing the messages of the prophets as for only future generations.

If they are poetry, they are beyond the present sphere of historical interest.[312] And, as has been seen already, and as will be seen further, the pressure of the actual removed Isaiah farther and farther away from what was not immediately pressing and real.[313] This latter observation leads to another proof of the fallacy of Duhm's contentions, namely, the Messianic oracles would suit far better, if genuine, the earlier periods of Isaiah's life--a time when, as Duhm admits,[314] the prophet was more general in his views rather than in the period when he was preoccupied with the very real events of the days toward the end of his career.

The eschatological school, likewise, is guilty of going off to extremes, and is wrong insofar as it justifies the Messianic oracles upon the easily acceptable and proved basis that Isaiah, along with Amos and others, made use of the eschatological heritage of his people. The mistake

---

[312] The investigator admits the validity of views such as those of Croce who sees the "poetry of yesterday. as the philosophy of today and the politics of tomorrow." His contention is that Isaiah was too occupied with the present.

[313] Hackmann clearly perceives this point, op. cit., pp. 167 ff. See also, R. H. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 438, under Messianic and Apocalyptic Oracles in Is. 1-39.

[314] See his reasons for putting 1:21 ff. early in the prophet's career, op. cit., p. 11.

lies in attributing indiscriminately to Isaiah oracles of material in its popular form--without its having been shorn of its immoral content.[315]

The neo-critical school, as represented by Fullerton, Hackmann, and J. M. P. Smith, is equally wrong in throwing out the Messianic oracles per se, or because they do not seem to fit Isaiah's message to the people or to the disciples, or because they do contain an eschatological-apocalyptic trait--provided that such oracles do not contain any nationalistic traits. When the matter is thoroughly examined, however, as far as the Messianic oracles do go, this school is right. Only one oracle, acceptable to all, which presents any picture of the future, is 1:21-26, and it has no Messianic significance.

Be all these matters as they may, the Messianic oracles lose all importance in the light of Isaiah's continued pronouncements of doom, even after the blockade was lifted, and in the light of their poetic rather than real picturizations.

2. The future of the remnant. It is taken for

---

[315] For the prophets' use of eschatological material, see K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints," p. 86; J. M. P. Smith, op. cit., pp. 256 ff. H. Dittmann, op. cit., almost escapes this fallacy, but not quite. He can not rid himself of the idea that Isaiah taught the doctrine of Zion's inviolability. This is also, alas, W. R. Smith's great weakness.

granted by all scholars that whatever expectations Isaiah might have had for the future were only for the remnant, however the remnant may be defined. It is necessary, then at this point to discover first, whom Isaiah had in mind when he referred to the remnant and second, what he expected in the future time after the work of judgment had been wrought.

a. The remnant. The greater measure of American scholars at least, have, unfortunately been overwhelmingly influenced by W. R. Smith who, although he made great strides towards correctly identifying the remnant in Isaiah, associated it with the inviolability of Jerusalem-Zion. Even those who reject this doctrine as a part of Isaiah's teaching are caught to a certain extent in the web woven by this great scholar.[316] There are a few, however, who have grasped the true meaning, and have seen that Isaiah all along expected the destruction of Jerusalem, itself (3:8; 6:11; 30:15-17, etc.); and that the remnant, instead of being identical with the Jerusalem community, consisted of the prophet's own inner circle of believers--

---

[316] Even Fullerton, "Viewpoints," pp. 38 ff., footnote 86, and Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 437, can not escape using the oft-quoted reference to the disciples as being the "beginning of the church." See W. R. Smith, op. cit., pp. 274 f. Smith, himself, was no doubt indebted to Wellhausen for the idea. See J. Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 485.

his disciples. Isaiah expected these alone to be saved in the judgment; they alone exercised the one necessity, faith. They would survive, be left over, preserved--by the miraculous intervention of Yahweh on their behalf. Hackmann, for instance identifies the remnant correctly when, in part, he says:

> Yet there are still a few in Judah, who stand out from the greater mass, in that they believing with the prophet trust in Jahve, among the blind seeing and among the deaf hearing, the "Disciples". In preference to them as in preference to his spectators Jahve will put aside the exhibition of his judgment, which they await. To them is now certainly carried over the idea of שאר.[317]

Beer is clear also in his grasp of the matter when he states, in part:

> Isaiah was essentially a prophet of doom. Only for a small remnant of his people had he ventured to express any hope. Trust in Jahve alone is for a scanty fraction of Israel the means of salvation out of the inescapable catastrophe approaching over the entire people.[318]

And again, in speaking of Isaiah's continued pronouncement of doom during 701:

> Now also, as for amply three decades the prophet maintains, that only a few will escape the blood-bath. Only he who remains quiet in trust in Jahve, who has set the Assyrian as Lord over Judah, will continue to live in the land and be able to enjoy its goods.[319]

---

[317] H. Hackmann, op. cit., p. 110.

[318] G. Beer, op. cit., p. 29.

[319] Ibid., p. 22.

b. The future. That Isaiah must have pictured the future for his disciples is felt by Mitchell,[320] Whitehouse,[321] and others. But in no place does Isaiah expressly give a picture of the future for the remnant, unless 1: 21-26 be considered as addressed to them.[322]

Hackmann disappoints those who turn to him for a solution, for he goes no further than to state that the prophet did expect a future for the remnant. For him, Isaiah is a prophet of faith, but not of hope.[323] He contents himself with saying in regard to the last period of the prophet's career:

> In this whole last epoch of the prophet's activity we hear nothing of a remnant who will survive the catastrophe, or of the beginning of a new. Radical predictions of destruction domineer everything.
> . . . . . .
> . . . That behind the ruin a new life must lie, he had known and said, without however, forsaking the present, to submerge himself in that future. . . .[324]

Beer does what Hackmann refuses to do, namely, like all those who do venture to present Isaiah's picture of

---

[320] H. G. Mitchell, Isaiah A Study of Chapters I.-XII, p. 207.

[321] O. C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 154.

[322] H. Hackmann, op. cit., footnote 2, feels that this passage can not be used because of its being interwoven with the thoughts of judgment.

[323] Ibid., p. 174.

[324] Ibid., pp. 171 f.

the future, using only genuine materials, he uses 1:21-26:

> . . . As for Jeremiah also for Isaiah the fall of the capital city brings about an ethical rebirth of Israel. Out of the ruins of Jerusalem Isaiah sees a new Zion arise, an Israelitish community filled up with love of justice I 26 . . . The prototype of his ideal future state is to the prophet the simplicity of Israel in the time of Moses and David.[325]

Pfeiffer is almost as bold as Beer. Says he:

> Concerned with the problems of the living generation of his people, Isaiah did not attempt to pierce the mystery of the future, if the preceding analysis of his oracles is valid. He merely assured his people that Jehovah, their divine king, would not allow Assyria to overstep its function--punishment of the nation (10:5-9, 13-15)--and bring Judah to its complete extinction. Jerusalem would be resurrected--after a faithful remnant, surviving the catastrophe, had returned to Jehovah--as a city of righteousness under the rule of new authorities (1:24-26).[326]

It seems to be more accurate for one, like Hackmann, to regard 1:21 ff. as too intimately connected with the threat of judgment upon the people to serve as Isaiah's picturization of the future. The passage can hardly be considered as addressed to the remnant. There is, however, one passage which does suggest itself as being the prophet's concluding words to the little band of disciples gathered around him, after the celebration (22:1-14) over the departure of the Assyrian armies had subsided, and the old

---

[325] G. Beer, op. cit., p. 30.

[326] R. H. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 438.

routine of life had been resumed. It is what Duhm[327] calls "a kind of theodicy on the sphere of prophecy and history,"--chapter 28:23-29.[328]

VI. SUMMARY STATEMENT

The preceding investigation has revealed two sought-for solutions in one, namely, the passages which may be correctly employed in determining Isaiah's philosophy of history, together with suggestive dates of origin for the individual passages, and hence, the sources to be used in determining the answer to the unanswered, second two of the four attitudes with which this study began:[329] 1, the attitude of the prophet towards the immediate future of the

---

[327] B. Duhm, op. cit., p. 179.

[328] Driver, Wade, Guthe, Giesebrecht and Hackmann (the three later are included upon the authority of Cheyne, op. cit., pp. 185 f.) regard the passage as not only genuine (as do also Duhm, Whitehouse (except v. 29), Skinner, Meinhold, and Kissane) but also as addressed to the remnant. See S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, pp. 223 f., and G. W. Wade, op. cit., p. 183.

Cheyne and Pfeiffer are the only ones, out of a great number, who definitely regard the passage as spurious. Kennett and McFadyen doubt its authenticity, while Box and Wade favor Isaian authorship. All the others accept it for genuine, but do not agree on its relationship to the context. See also page 30 of this study.

[329] Supra, pp. 1 ff.

Assyrian armies and of the populace of Judah, and 2, the prophet's attitude towards the future of the remnant.

Disregarding the matter of date for the time being, the sources for the first of these previously unsolved attitudes, in the order of their appearance, are: 1:21-26; 2:6-21; 3:1-4:1 (minus verses 10-11, 18-23?, 25-26?); 5:1-29 (minus verses 15-16); 6 (minus the last clause in verse 13); 7; 8:5-8a, 14b-15, 21-22); 10:1-3(4), 5-9, 13-14(15); 22:1-14; 28 (minus verses 5-6); 29:1-4(5-8); 30:1-17 (minus verses 6-7); and 31:1-4. Those concerned with the prophet's attitude toward the immediate future of the Assyrian armies are: 2:12-21; 5:25-29; 7:17, 18-25; 8:5-8b; 10:3b, 5-9, 13-14(15); 28:11-15, 18-19; 30:17; while those that concern themselves with the prophet's attitude toward the immediate future of the Judean populace are: 1:21-26; 2:6-21; 3:1-4:1 (minus verses 10-11, 18-23?, 25-26?); 5:1-29 (minus verses 15-16); 6 (minus the last clause in verse 13); 7; 8:5-8a, 14b-15, 21-22; 10:1-3(4); 22:1-14; 28:14-22; 29:1-4(5-8); 30:1-17 (minus verses 6-7); and 31:1-4. Sources for the second of the prophet's attitudes, that towards the future of the remnant, were found to be non-

existent![330] There is, however, one passage which may be regarded as the prophet's last words to his disciples, the remnant: 28:23-29.

With respect, now, to the dating of the particular passages, it was discovered that this matter recedes into the background, in view of the fact that the prophet's attitude, as concerns not only Judah and the remnant, but also Assyria as well, remained consistently the same throughout his entire career; it never changed, even with respect to Assyria! What did happen was that the prophet's attitude underwent a development. From concerning himself at first with general matters and the whole earth, he turned increasingly to a dealing with the specific matters at hand in his own homeland. The immediate problems of a very real present forced him to concentrate intermittently during the years, and then finally, entirely upon the remnant, his disciples.

---

[330] To the sources for the prophet's attitude towards the immediate future of the Assyrian armies and the populace of Judah should be added the biographical passage, chapter 20, which did not present a problem in the preceding discussion.

Although there are no passages which discuss or manifest the prophet's attitude towards the future of the remnant, there are two which do reveal his attitude towards them as a present entity. These are 8:16-19, and 28:16.

VII. CONCLUSION

This chapter began with the thesis that, although Isaiah had many nations within his sphere of interest, his philosophy of history is to be seen most clearly in his views of Assyria in relationship with Judah; and in his future expectations for the remnant, which themselves are connected with the Assyrian-Judean relationship. In order to discover the prophet's philosophy of history, it was deemed necessary to trace his attitudes in four different aspects: 1, his attitudes at the very beginning of his career in regard to the general situations or conditions about him; 2, his early attitudes towards Assyria and Judah, particularly; 3, his attitudes towards the immediate future of the Assyrian armies and the populace of Judah, and 4, his attitude toward the future of the remnant. The first two of these aspects presented no problem; while the second two were considered to be dependent for their solution upon the authenticity of the anti-Assyrian, anti-Judean, and Messianic oracles in chapters 1-39 of the book of Isaiah.

Before the prophet's attitudes in the second two aspects could be traced, therefore, it was necessary to determine which passages are genuine and which are not. Thereupon, an investigation of critical authorities was made, which revealed that only the anti-Judean oracles and one so-

called anti-Assyrian oracle are genuinely Isaiah's. The anti-Judean oracles, and the one anti-Assyrian oracle only, therefore, may be used in the reconstruction of Isaiah's philosophy of history.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF THE TIMES OF ISAIAH[1]

Insofar as Isaiah's philosophy of history is concerned, the history of the prophet's times might well consider only that of Assyria and Judah. Nevertheless, the events that shaped his views took place to a greater or lesser extent in all the countries of the Fertile Crescent and even outside it; and the relationships between Assyria and Judah are better understood in light of the role played by many of these other countries. This chapter will discuss, therefore, the pertinent historical events and conditions of the Near and Middle East from the period beginning roughly in 850 and extending to 700 B. C.

---

[1] The sources used for this construction of the history of Isaiah's time were: K. Fullerton, "Isaiah's Attitude in the Sennacherib Campaign," A. J. S. L. L. XLII (October, 1925); G. S. Goodspeed, A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902); E. A. Leslie, "The Chronology of the Old Testament," A. B. C. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1929), pp. 108-113; Elmer W. K. Mould, Essentials of Bible History (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1939); Lewis Bayles Paton, The Early History of Syria and Palestine (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901); and T. H. Robinson, A History of Israel (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), Vol. I. Of great assistance also were: E. A. Leslie, Old Testament Religion (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1936), Chaps. V and VI, and John Punnett Peters, The Religion of the Hebrews (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1914), Chaps. XIII and XIV.

I. INITIAL CONTACTS BETWEEN ASSYRIA AND THE HEBREW KINGDOMS

The first contact of Assyria with the Hebrew kingdoms, particularly Israel, goes back to the year 853, at which time Shalmaneser III of Assyria led an army into the west, bent on reaching the Mediterranean and Palestine. The Assyrian was resisted successfully at Karkar, by a coalition at the head of which were Benhadad of Syria and Ahab of Israel. Despite this set-back, Shalmaneser returned in 841 and laid siege to Damascus, the capital city of Syria. After this event of 841, no more is heard of Assyrian armies in the west for an entire generation.

Damascus soon recovered from the Assyrian siege, and renewed an old strife of long standing between Syria and Israel. As a result of this strife Israel was either kept in a subservient position to her neighbor on the northeast or was prohibited from making progress within as well as without her borders for many years. Finally, in 805, the Assyrians returned westward once more, and plundered Damascus to the extent that she could no longer be a serious rival of or menace to Israel.

II. ISRAEL AND JUDAH IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY

The year 805 saw Assyria and Syria outside the im-

mediate sphere of influence for both the Hebrew kingdoms; and, what was more, Egypt was still, after many years, in a weakened condition, and thus in no position to interfere in Palestinian affairs. Israel and Judah were now free to go their respective ways unhampered by outsiders for the next sixty years. During this time, however, Judah was in a position of vassalage to her northern sister, yet free under such a limitation to pursue pretty much her own course without much molestation.

A. Economic prosperity and exploitation. Under Jeroboam II of Israel (786-745), and under Uzziah of Judah (780-740), the Hebrew kingdoms made great and rapid progress during the first half of the eighth century. Israel's borders were extended from the entrance of Hamath in the north to the Dead Sea in the south, and beyond the Jordan into Moabite territory. Judah, close behind her sister kingdom, extended her borders southward to Elath by capturing Edom, and pushed toward the Mediterranean by invading Philistine territories. Gath, Ashdod, and other cities of Philistia were added to the Judahite domain. In addition, the Ammonites were made to pay tribute into the treasury of Judah. At the death of Uzziah, in 740, Judah could boast of a southern boundary that touched upon Egypt and the Red Sea, an eastern boundary that extended beyond the

Jordan, a northern boundary that reached Israel, and a western boundary that extended to the Mediterranean Sea.

These conquests of Israel and Judah served to produce a condition of prosperity unknown since the days of Solomon. Stores of booty, plundered from the captured cities, were added to each country's supply of goods. Trade revived, and fees from command of the trade routes through Palestine poured into the treasuries of the two countries. A class of wealthy merchants grew up, and these merchants vied with their kings in erecting costly palaces on city and country estates. Luxurious living, characterized by fine houses and furniture, imports from foreign countries, wine and revelry, was the fare of the rich who, day by day, grew richer.

On the other hand, however, the development of a wealthy class produced an equally as poor group, far more numerous than the prosperous. The small peasant farmer gradually disappeared, and in his place arose the wealthy landlord who joined estate to estate, often through a system that incorporated laws of debt. These large estates were worked mainly by slave labor, or by nominally free tenants from whom exorbitant fees were exacted by the landlords. Adding to the sad lot of the poor, and making conditions for them increasingly worse, were injustices and bribery in the courts, cheating of the poor in the markets,

and a vicious system of money-lending, which often saw the borrower sold into slavery for a pair of sandals.

B. Religious conditions.[2] When one turns from a consideration of the lot of the poor in both kingdoms to a general picture of the religious situation, one sees that it was equally as bad, and even a contributing factor in the evil economic and social conditions.

In general, there were really three types of religious expression, all going back in origin presumably to the religion of Moses. There was the religion of the official Yahweh cult, the religion of the masses, and the religion of the true prophets which was shared to a degree by such groups as the Rechabites. To the official religion of the Yahweh cult, the masses, condoned by the official religious leaders, added superstitions and Canaanite practices so that it was really difficult to distinguish the religion of Yahweh from that of the Baalim. The true prophets remained closer to the religion of the nomadic period, and of certain

---

[2] The material used in this section is based primarily upon views set forth by the following sources: Fleming James, et al., The Beginnings of our Religion (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934), Chap. III; E. A. Leslie, Old Testament Religion, and The Prophets Tell Their Own Story (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1939), Chap. III; Adolphe Lods, La Religion D' Israël ((Paris?:) Librairie Hachette, 1939), Chap. III; J. P. Peters, op. cit.; and T. H. Robinson, A History of Israel, Chap. XVII.

sections of the population--a religion unembellished with Canaanite accretions.

The overall picture of religious conditions is that of the masses. It was hardly more than Baalism, carried on in the name of Yahweh. Sacrifices were multiplied without number; the courts of temples and shrines were trampled increasingly. Tithes and other religious obligations were paid with great regularity; and the sabbath, along with feast days and holy seasons, was regarded with strict observance. Pilgrimages to shrines, near and distant, were made in great number. All was done in the name of Yahweh, yet all was divorced from social morality. In fact, the religion not only failed to condemn the rampant immorality of the time; it often enjoined it. Fertility cults abounded, and sacred prostitution was a regular part of worship. In addition to all these conditions, the religious leaders were corrupt, joining in the oppression of the poor at the hands of the rich. Prophet and priest labored for a fee, speaking not the word, nor teaching the law of Yahweh. They shared the drunken revelries, and materialistic outlook of the secular leaders of the age.

Two main ideas stood out in regard to Yahweh. He was the national god of both countries. He was a holy god. He was bound by covenant to the Hebrews, and he was obligated

by the religious practices carried on in his name not only to continue the prosperity of the present, but to lead his people to even greater victories over their enemies and, consequently, to still more prosperious conditions. On every hand, expectations ran high for the coming of the "Day of Yahweh," which was to bring the fulfillment of the popular dream.

It was into the very midst of such economic, social, and religious conditions that Amos and Hosea were to come, in Israel; and Isaiah and Micah, in Judah. Around 760, Amos made his appearance upon the scene in Israel, proclaiming doom upon the nation unless it met Yahweh's real requirements of justice and righteousness.

III. THE REWAKENING OF ASSYRIA

Although by 750 Assyria had fallen lower than she had been for a century, a new day dawned for her and for the Near and Middle East when, in 745, an usurper ascended the throne, assuming the title Tiglath-pileser III. Under this new leader, Assyria was to recover not only her old prestige and power; she was to extend her sway even to the doors of Egypt. While the new claimant to the Assyrian throne was securing his position at home, Jeroboam II of Israel died (745), and his country fell victim to internal strife and

anarchy. Ruler after ruler was to succeed one another in rapid succession during the next few years, and this, added to the already bad economic and social conditions, was to witness the collapse of the nation predicted by Amos. Uzziah of Judah followed Jeroboam II in death five years later (740) and, although the dynasty of David was to continue on the throne, no such leader as he was to appear to direct the destinies of Judah. What was more, circumstances were to change for Judah as well as for Israel with the reawakening of Assyria. And just as Amos had appeared in Israel twenty years before, decrying the conditions there and predicting doom, so did Isaiah appear in the year of the death of Uzziah, proclaiming the same message which Amos had declared.

Tiglath-pileser spent the first ten years of his reign in reducing the east to submission and order. He then turned to the west, and in 738 made an expedition to the Mediterranean, receiving homage and tribute from a number of the local rulers, among whom was Menahem of Israel. Driven by fear of further Assyrian encroachments, several of the western states fixed upon a plan of union, headed by Damascus and Samaria. The allies sought to bring Judah into the coalition by peaceful means, but failing, sought then to bring her in by force of arms. The struggle which ensued is known as the Syro-Ephraimitic War.

IV. THE SYRO-EPHRAIMITIC WAR

In the first stages of the conflict, while Jotham was still on the Judean throne, it appears that only the outlying districts of Judah were ravaged, and many of the inhabitants were made prisoners of war. Edom and the Philistine cities, subjected to Judean rule under Uzziah, revolted, gained their freedom, and aided the Syrians and Israelites in devastating their erstwhile mistress. A second stage of the war seems to center around a projected or actual siege of Judah's capital city, Jerusalem. The allies had determined to depose Ahaz, who had succeeded Jotham in the midst of the conflict, and to put in his place a puppet, the son of Tabeel. In distress, the Judean monarch sacrificed his first born son. As a further step towards security, he strengthened the city's fortifications, and contemplated sending to the Assyrians for assistance. After a time, when it appeared that the sacrifice of his son had been to no avail, and the fortifications seemed insufficient to endure an attack of long duration, Ahaz sent to the Assyrians. Hardly needing such an invitation, yet gladly accepting the tribute which Ahaz sent along with the request, the Assyrians came and put the besiegers to rout.

Syria was depopulated, and all of Israel from the plain of Esdraelon northwards, and Gilead across the Jordan

were overrun. Rezin, the Syrian king was killed; while Pekah, the Israelite ruler, was either deposed or murdered, and Hoshea was put in his place under Assyrian suzerainty. Before the Assyrian force returned home, it went as far south as Gaza, and even threatened Egypt.

Judah was spared, however, and Ahaz, with many other local rulers, was called to Damascus where the Assyrian king held court. Here he had to swear allegiance to his rescuer, and accept a position of vassalage to the Assyrian king. Entailed in this position seems to have been a certain recognition of Asshur, the Assyrian national god, for an altar was set up in Jerusalem in honor of this god and his cult.

V. FROM THE SYRO-EPHRAIMITIC WAR TO THE FALL OF ISRAEL

In 727, Tiglath-pileser died, and was succeeded by Shalmaneser V. Many of the western states, including Israel, who was receiving encouragement from Egypt at this time felt that now was a good time to throw off the Assyrian yoke. Intrigues, covering the whole region from the Orontes valley to Egypt, were engaged in, and plans laid for revolt. With promises of aid from Egypt, Hoshea of Israel broke into open rebellion in 725 or 724, and Shalmaneser made haste to Palestine. Although Hoshea was soon captured and im-

prisoned, the capital city of Israel, Samaria, held out for three long years. During the latter part of the siege Shalmaneser died, leaving the task of annihilating the city to Sargon II, his successor. Finally, in 722-721, the city fell, and the kingdom of Israel came to an end.

No sooner had Sargon brought the Israelite capital low than he was recalled to the east where he seems to have waged an unsuccessful war with Elam and the Chaldean prince Merodach-baladan. A battle was fought at Durilu in 721-720, in which both sides claimed the victory. Sargon appears to have lost, however, for Merodach-baladan was able to secure the throne of Babylon and maintain himself there for the next ten years. This failure of the Assyrian arms in the east greatly lowered the prestige of Sargon in the west, and, consequently, a new revolt broke out in this latter region in 720.

The main centers of this new uprising were Hamath in the north and Gaza in the south. Allied with Hamath were Arpad and Simirra in North Syria and Phoenicia, and the remnants of Damascus and Samaria. The chief support of Hanno, king of Gaza, appears to have been Egypt, although Judah, whose help had been solicited by Gaza, might have been implicated under her new king, Hezekiah.[3] Despite

---

[3] The beginning of Hezekiah's reign is set in 720 by Fullerton, Leslie, Mould, Pfeiffer, et al. Fullerton associates the reference in the Nimrud Inscription, to the land Ja-u-du, to this time, 720. See his article, "Isaiah's Attitude," pp. 12 f., and 25.

the fact that there was some sort of mutual agreement between the two groups of insurrectionists, Sargon acted too quickly for them to combine forces. He advanced southwards where he met and defeated Hanno and a relief army from Egypt at Raphia. Hanno was captured, but the Egyptian tartan, Sibe', who was at the head of the Egyptian forces managed to escape. Sargon then marched into the north where he disposed of the king of Hamath and his allies, at Karkar. Israel was razed to the ground, and 29,290 of her inhabitants were carried away captive into distant lands. To take their place, Sargon imported colonists from other parts of his realm and settled them in the former northern kingdom where they intermarried with the Hebrews left in the land. A portion of the erstwhile Israelite territory was given to Judah.

VI. FROM THE FALL OF ISRAEL TO 705

For the next few years, until 713, the western states endured with patience the yoke of Assyria. After this year, however, strivings after liberation were again in the air, and intrigues among all the southwestern regions against Assyrian domination developed with increasing significance. Ever since Hezekiah had come to throne, in 720, an anti-Assyrian party had been growing in strength, and Judah was ready to throw in her lot with the other con-

spirators. Moreover, after 712, Egypt, under Shabaka, was once again united, and eager to create buffer states between Assyria and herself. Sargon at the time was engaged principally with wars in Armenia, and was thus unable to give attention to the west until 711.

A. The rebellion of 711. By 711, Philistia, Egypt, Judah, Moab, and Edom had perfected a coalition, and a revolt, centered at Ashdod, burst into flame. At last free from the wars in Armenia, Sargon sent an expeditionary force which was sufficient for the task of dealing with the rebels. Ashdod was quickly subdued. Her king, Azuru, was deposed, and his brother, Ahimitu, was placed in his stead. At the beginning of the conflict, Judah, Edom, and Moab hastened to renew their allegiance to the Assyrian crown, and escaped punishment by repayment of tribute. The people of Ashdod, however, refused to accept the Assyrian nominee to the throne, and thereupon, Sargon destroyed not only the city but also Gath and Ashdudimmu, two other Philistine city states. Ashdod was then converted into an Assyrian province, while Gaza and Ekron were permitted to have tributary kings of their own. Egypt, who had not given any real help to Gaza, due perhaps to the suddenness of the Assyrian attack, was left face to face with the empire whose center lay beyond the Euphrates. And thus ended the revolt of 711,

even as that of 720, in failure.

B. From 711 to 705. After the unsuccessful revolt of 711, Sargon returned to the east where trouble with Merodach-baladan had again raised its head. During the years 710-709, he succeeded in driving Merodach-baladan out of Babylon, and united the city with his empire. The former Babylonian ruler escaped, however, and found refuge in lower Mesopotamia where he awaited a new opportunity to contest the Assyrians. Troubles in Babylon continued for Sargon, and new dangers arose in the north from encroachments by the Cimmerians. It was, apparently, in a war with these new enemies that Sargon perished in 705, his army sustaining a serious reversal at his death.

VII. THE REBELLION OF 705-701

Sargon was succeeded by his son, Sennacherib, in 705. As usual, the change in Assyrian rulers, in addition to the reverses suffered by Assyria at the time of Sargon's death, aroused hopes of freedom in the subject states of the west. Moreover, Merodach-baladan reappeared and sought to organize a general revolt throughout the whole Assyrian empire. After securing immediate support from Aramean, Arabian, and some Akkadian tribes, in addition to support from Elam, he turned to the far west, in order to bring that region

into the project. Messengers were sent to Palestine, where they were received favorably by Hezekiah,[4] and probably also to Egypt. Soon, all the states of the west, led by Judah, and including Ammon, Moab, Phoenicia, and Philistia, were in open rebellion. Only three vassal rulers remained faithful to Assyrian overlordship: Mitinti of Ashdod, Silli-bêl of Gaza, and Padi of Ekron. Padi, however, was dethroned by his own subjects, and was sent to Jerusalem, which was probably the strongest fortress in the region, where he was confined to prison by Hezekiah.

A. Religious reform under Hezekiah.[5] The first official act committed by Hezekiah, once revolt was decided upon, was a purification of the cultus of all Assyrian influences introduced under his father, Ahaz.[6] This act was equivalent to a declaration of independence from Assyria. It shows, too, the extent to which the anti-Assyrian party

---

[4] That 705, rather than some other date, was the time of the Babylonian embassy to Hezekiah seems to be quite clear, and is accepted now rather generally by scholars.

[5] Among those who place Hezekiah's reforms at this time, and relate them to the declaration of independence from Assyria, are: Fleming James, Personalities of the Old Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945), pp. 255 ff.; Christopher R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History (London: The Epworth Press, 1946), p. 105; L. B. Paton, op. cit., p. 252; F. Wilke, op. cit., pp. 47 f., T. H. Robinson, A History of Israel, p. 388; and others.

[6] See above, p. 95.

in Judah had grown; and the extent to which Hezekiah was carried away by the popular, national religion, which regarded Yahweh still as the national god who was bound to give his people victory in war. But, even if Yahweh should prove impotent, there were allies who could be depended upon, especially Egypt, who was once again quite powerful.

B. The collapse of the revolt. Sennacherib spent the years from 705 to 701 in dealing with Merodach-baladan and the east. Then, in 701, he descended, like a meteor, upon the west. Phoenicia, with the exception of Tyre, submitted without offering much resistance. The main Assyrian army then headed south to deal with Philistia and Egypt. Detached bodies of troops were sent to ravage Judah, and other sections. Quickly, the Philistine cities were reduced by force. While Ekron was being besieged, a relief army from Egypt marched up, only to be defeated at Eltekeh, and pursued towards its home. Meanwhile, Lachish had been reduced and made into the Assyrian headquarters; Judah had been overrun, and Hezekiah, shut up in Jerusalem as a bird in a cage, submitted to the Assyrian arms. He released Padi to the Assyrians who, in turn, reinstated Padi upon his throne and gave him some of the Judean territories. In addition, Hezekiah was required to pay an enormous tribute in money and in the women of the harem. For the time being he was permitted to retain Jerusalem.

While following up his victory over the Egyptians, news from the east, in addition to possibly disease among his troops, recalled Sennacherib home. The blockade of Jerusalem, which had continued, was lifted, and the Assyrian armies departed without having razed it to the ground. Nevertheless, Sennacherib succeeded in laying heavy tribute upon the west and in carrying heavy spoil with him when he did go. And, if the close of his campaign had been inglorious, he had succeeded in his purpose.

> . . . Never again during his reign did the kings of the west raise the hand of revolt against him. The punishment had been effectual. Sennacherib entered the west only once again, and then only to make a foray against Arabian tribes whose constant restlessness needed frequent restraint and sometimes severe chastisement.[7]

---

[7] G. S. Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 272.

CHAPTER III

ISAIAH IN RELATION TO THE HISTORY OF HIS TIMES

In the first chapter of this study, the sources which must be used in the discovery of Isaiah's philosophy of history were isolated from the general body of material in chapters 1-39, and the relative dating of the pertinent oracles was established. The second chapter was devoted to the history of the prophet's times. The present chapter now seeks to relate the prophet to his times by placing the genuine oracles in their historical settings and to continue a tracing of the prophet's attitudes--left off soon after the study began.[1] In addition to the sources already employed in the setting forth of his attitudes in the first two aspects, that is, his general attitudes at the beginning of his career, and his early attitudes towards the Assyrian armies and Judah, it is necessary here to use only those sources that continue to show the mutual relationship between Assyria and Judah.

I. FROM 740 TO THE END OF THE SYRO-EPHRAIMITIC WAR

After the threat of doom upon his people, contained in the account of his call, and the announcement of the im-

---

[1] Supra, p. 2.

pending "Day of Yahweh," the prophet continued his pronouncements of doom upon his people (3:1-4:1; 5:1-25), becoming, all the while more specific, and awaiting the arrival of the "Day of Yahweh."

Already the Assyrians were on an upsurge of power, and it is difficult not to believe that Isaiah attached great significance to their actions. The western states, threatened by the Assyrian cloud on the horizon, forgot local differences for the time being, and some of them formed a coalition against the impending foe. Among these states were Syria (Damascus), Israel (Samaria), Philistia (Gaza), Edom, and a few others. Judah, refusing to ally herself with the coalition, was subjected to various attacks in an effort to force her to join, or to depose the Judean monarch in order to replace him with a puppet who would be favorable towards the allied design. Some of her outlying districts were devastated, others were torn loose from her possession, and Jerusalem, itself, was threatened with a siege. During the course of events, the Judean king, Jotham, died, to be succeeded by his son, Ahaz.

In the midst of the war, particularly after the capital and the Davidic dynasty were threatened, Ahaz sacrificed his first-born son in an attempt to appease the anger of Yahweh against his people, Judah. The peril remained, however, and the king made preparations to withstand the

siege as best he could. Apparently, also, he now decided to appeal to Assyria for aid, so grave had the situation become. At the peak of this crisis, when "the heart of the king and the heart of his people trembled as the trees of the forest trembled with the wind" (7:2b), Isaiah approached the king in the act of inspecting some of the city's material resources. Along with him, he had brought his little son, Shear-Jashub (a remnant shall return)--implying far more doom than hope[2]--who had been born during the reign of Jotham and who was now old enough to walk. Conscious of the panic which had gripped the king and the people, and sensing the king's confidence, weak as it was, in material resources, if not also in human resources represented by Assyria,[3] Isaiah advised him to:

> Take heed and be quiet; fear not, neither let thy heart be faint (7:4a), . . . If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established (7:9b).

Ere long the confederacy represented by Damascus and Samaria would be no more. With no faith in Yahweh any longer, but obviously having confidence in Assyria, the

---

[2] Julius A. Bewer, The Literature of the Old Testament (Revised Edition; New York: Columbia University Press, 1922), p. 105.

[3] Isaiah was not in this situation "anti-Assyrian". See K. Fullerton, "Isaiah's Attitude in the Sennacherib Campaign," A. J. S. L. L. XLII (October, 1925), 8.

king refused the prophetic counsel.

Isaiah now returned, it appears, to his work among the people, pleading with them to learn a lesson from the present situation (5:13, 20-25).[4] They, too, so it appears, turned deaf ears to his counsel. In response, the prophet uttered an oracle in which, by implication he pointed to the Assyrians as the instruments whom Yahweh was going to use against his godless people (5:26-29).[5]

Later on, it seems, after Ahaz had appealed to the Assyrians for help, Isaiah approached him a second time.[6] He was now aware of what Ahaz had done, but he offered a sign to the king as a guarantee of the faith in Yahweh that he had urged. Acting piously, Ahaz refused a sign, and at the same time disgusted the prophet to the extent that the latter revealed his knowledge of the appeal to Assyria for help. What was more, he proceeded to give a sign anyway. More certain now than ever before of Yahweh's judgment upon his country, and more specific because of his development

---

[4] L. B. Paton, op. cit., p. 238, points out that Ahaz's army was defeated, his cities destroyed, and many of his people were taken captive.

[5] J. A. Bewer, op. cit., p. 107.

[6] H. G. Mitchell, Isaiah: A Study of Chapters I-XII., pp. 172 ff.

during the course of events in his pronouncements of judgment, he mentioned the Assyrians by name as Yahweh's agents in the destruction still to come. Although the Assyrians would respond to the plea for help, they would engulf Judah who had called them hither along with Damascus and Samaria (8:5-8a). The prophet addressed his statement first to Ahaz (7:17-25), and then to the people at large (8:5-8a, 14b-15). It is to be noted that he had already by this time ceased his general interests, (the "Day of Yahweh" upon all and everything), and was concentrating on the immediate affairs of his own people.

Fully conscious of the refusal of both king and people to exercise faith in Yahweh as the proper course of action, and aware of their confidence in other entities, Assyria, wizards, and those who had familiar spirits (8:19), the prophet turned to those who did exercise faith, and who did cling to his teachings,--the remnant, already in existence (8:16-18).[7] This did not mean that he had closed the doors against anyone who in the future might desire to enter the fellowship of "his children"; whosoever would might still come in.

As predicted, the Assyrians did come. They would

---

[7] Ibid., pp. 200 ff. See also, E. A. Leslie, The Prophets Tell Their Own Story, pp. 93 ff.

have come anyway, but Judah's cry for help gave them a greater impetus, perhaps, than they had had before. Judah was relieved of her assailants. Damascus was annihilated; Samaria subdued. And although Judah was not invaded, she was forced to pay tribute, and to swear allegiance to her erstwhile rescuer. In addition, Judah was required to share the worship of Yahweh with Asshur, the god of Assyria.

II. FROM THE SYRO-EPHRAIMITIC WAR TO THE COLLAPSE OF ISRAEL

Instead of forsaking the king and the people entirely, the prophet, now that a position of vassalage for Judah had come about, counselled loyalty to the Assyrians. This he did, not that such loyalty would turn aside Yahweh's judgment, but in order that the country might continue in existence as long as possible under the existing circumstances, and in order that he might thus continue the work of enlarging the remnant. He continued to preach "faith in Yahweh" as the only course for survival.

Between the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic War and for a while after the fall of Samaria, there is no record of the prophet's activity, unless it is shown in 28:1-4,[8] and in the latter half of chapter 9.[9] Both these oracles, how-

---

[8] So K. Fullerton, op. cit., p. 9, footnote 1.

[9] J. A. Bewer, op. cit., p. 107.

ever, concern Israel rather than Judah. And as long as the northern kingdom stood, certain phases of his growing philosophy of history had no cause to be stated. But when the fall of the sister nation did occur, it may well be assumed that there was a great deal of questioning within individual minds, as well as in groups, in Judah.[10] To the average person in Judah, including the prophet's own adherents to a greater or lesser extent, the collapse of the nation meant the collapse of the national god. Yahweh was the god of Israel; Asshur had prevailed over Yahweh. The answers given by Isaiah were given, not to the masses, but to his disciples, even as later on Jesus was to share with his disciples many things that he kept back from the multitudes (Matthew 13:1--12).

Already he had announced that Yahweh was going to call the Assyrians hither as his agents; now he might well have reasserted this theme, and elaborated on Yahweh's purpose with Assyria as the instrument in his hands. Yahweh's purpose up to this point was clear: it is to bring about the abasement of all that is lifted up in pride; to destroy all that is unclean with sin. Among the questions which now had to be faced were, in addition to that of

---

[10] For suggestions on this idea, see S. R. Driver, Isaiah: His Life and Times, p. 48, and O. C. Whitehouse, Isaiah, 20. See also H. G. Mitchell, op. cit., p. 207.

Yahweh's having been overcome by Asshur and his collapse with Israel, some such as: "If Yahweh is using Assyria, how can he employ an evil agent to effect his purpose?"; "Just how far are the Assyrians to go?"; "How, when, and where will the Assyrians be stopped?"; "What about the future for Judah?"

Would the prophet have answered such questions? Well may he have, for,

> . . . It is inconceivable that he should not, either before or during the darkness that he had predicted, have given them [the disciples] some idea of what was in store for them, . . .[11]

III. FROM THE ANNIHILATION OF ISRAEL TO THE BEGINNING OF SENNACHERIB'S REIGN.

A. The Crisis of 720. Even though the previous conjecture may be regarded as true, such questions demanded an answer even more in the days that lay ahead. And from such theoretical discussions with his disciples, the prophet was called almost immediately--into public activity once again. The cause that called him forth possessed several angles. Among these were: Assyrian troubles in the east; a change in rulers at home in Judah; and a consequent change in Judah's attitude toward Assyria. In addition to Assyria's momentarily weakened condition, and

---

[11] H. G. Mitchell, loc. cit.

lowered prestige in the west, there was an upsurge of power in Egypt, represented at this time by the Delta princes. Philistia, supported by Egypt, sought to bring Judah into an anti-Assyrian coalition, and apparently found ready ears among a growing anti-Assyrian party in this latter country. Isaiah appeared, and uttered the oracle preserved in 14:28-32. In the words of Fullerton:

> This, of course, means that Isaiah was opposed to Judah's joining the coalition. His policy was the same as it was in 735, but the principle was differently applied. In the former case he protested against resorting to Assyria for help against Rezin and Damascus; now he protests against relying upon Philistia for help against Assyria. It would seem as if Isaiah thought that when once the decision had been made to submit to Assyria, it was far wiser to remain loyal. He had witnessed what terrible consequences had come upon Israel through its pursuit of an anti-Assyrian policy. If Judah were to be delivered it must be by Yahweh, not by diplomatic intrigues with other nations. . . .[12]

On this occasion in 720 Isaiah's efforts did not go unrewarded. Judah steered clear of the anti-Assyrian coalition which met with disastrous defeat.

B. The crisis of 713-711. Anti-Assyrian sentiment continued to increase, however, and by 713, strivings after liberation from the Assyrian yoke were again in progress. From the very first there must have been much activity of this nature in Judah. At least, the prophet so interpreted the state of things, and entered once again public life. For the next three years he went about in the role of

---

[12] K. Fullerton, op. cit., p. 14.

a continuous warning to his people against any reliance upon Egypt and Ethiopia particularly (chapter 20). In this biographical chapter can be seen the answer to at least a few of the questions which were pertinent also in 721. He expected the Assyrians to continue on their rampage until even Egypt and Ethiopia would be overrun and brought under their sway. And, what was of greater importance, not only for Judah but for all the coastal states, was that those who were relying upon Egypt and Ethiopia for assistance against Assyria would be sadly disappointed (verse 6).

It was not until 711 that Sargon, the Assyrian ruler, was able to reappear in the west. When he did come, or rather, send a small force, which was sufficient for the task, the allies were defeated. Judah, Edom, and Moab, however, escaped punishment by withdrawing early, reasserting their loyalty, and by paying an indemnity. That Isaiah had a harder time on this occasion than in 720 is self-evident. The occasion shows too that the anti-Assyrian party was gaining strength in Judah; and casts a shadow of what was still to come.

IV. THE CRISIS OF 705-701

Hezekiah, the Judean King since 720, came of age in 705--the beginning of one of the most eventful periods in the history of his nation. Old enough now to decide for

himself, and contrary to whatever attempts Isaiah might have continued to make in order to preserve the vassalge to Assyria, he sided completely with the anti-Assyrian party which had grown to man-size proportions. The time was just ripe for revolt. Sargon had died recently and Sennacherib, his successor, was having difficulties not only in establishing himself at home, but also in the east, due to the machinations of the perennial thorn in the flesh to Assyria, Merodach-baladan. And, as if these were not sufficient to encourage revolt in Judah, similar ambitions among the neighboring states brought them to the support of the anti-Assyrian cause. Additional impetus was given by Merodach-baladan who sent an embassy to visit the Judean monarch; and by promises of support from Egypt who was once again quite strong and watchful of Assyrian aggression in the west. The cup of revolt filled thus to overflowing, Hezekiah assumed leadership of a coalition in which Phoenicia, Philistia, Judea, and others embarked upon a campaign to be rid of Assyria once and for all times.

One of Hezekiah's first acts, once revolt was decided, was to initiate a reform in religion. To purge the cult of Assyrian influence would be a declaration of independence from Assyria. And, contrary to what many biblical scholars seem to believe, Isaiah would have been in

direct opposition to such a turn of events.[13] Asshur was not replaced by Yahweh; Asshur was replaced by trust in Egypt-Ethiopia, horses and chariots! To be sure, a sort of Yahweh worship continued as before. A picture of it is given in chapter 1, and also in chapter 29. It was a "drawing nigh unto Yahweh with the mouth, and the fear of him was a commandment of men which had been taught them" (29:13). Many of the prophet's most stinging oracles of doom upon his people originated at this time, as is universally admitted by scholars. Some of them are to be found in chapters 18; 28:11 ff.; 29; 30; and 31. In these passages Isaiah answered still more of the perplexing questions. He pointed out the folly of relying upon Egypt over against relying upon Yahweh for help:

> Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help, and rely on horses, and trust in chariots because they are many, and in horsemen because they are very strong, but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek Jehovah! Yet he also is wise, and will bring evil, and will not call back his words, but will arise against the house of evil-doers, and against the help of them that work iniquity. Now the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses flesh, and not spirit: and when Jehovah shall stretch out his hand, both he that helpeth shall stumble, and he that is helped shall fall, and they shall fall, and they shall all be consumed together.
>
> For thus saith Jehovah unto me, As the lion and the

---

[13] This is admitted by F. Wilke, Jesaja und Assur, pp. 41 f., 109., and by even S. R. Driver, The Ideals of the Prophets (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915), p. 21; as well as by R. H. Kennett, The Composition of the Book of Isaiah, pp. 19 f.

> young lion growling over his prey, if a multitude of shepherds be called forth against him, will not be dismayed at their voice, nor abase himself for the noise of them: so will Jehovah of hosts come down to fight against mount Zion, and against the hill thereof (31:1-4).

Tired of Isaiah's babble: "precept upon precept; . . . line upon line, . . . here a little, there a little . . .", the leaders ridiculed him (28:9-10). In reply he made known in positive language that people of a foreign speech would speak to them [the Assyrians] in a language which they would understand (28:11-13). And in further reply to their scoffing at his prediction of the scourge that was still to overrun Judah (even as he had proclaimed years before), he reasserted that it would pass through day after day until the whole land would be trodden down by it (28:14-22). Furthermore, chapters 29 and 30 help to picture what lies in store. The finale is reached in 30:15:

> For thus said the Lord Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel, In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength: and ye would not.[14]

No!--the Judeans "would not":

> But ye said, No, for we will flee upon horses; therefore shall ye flee: and, We will ride upon the swift; therefore shall they that pursue you be swift. One thousand shall flee[15] at the threat of one; at the threat of five shall ye flee: till ye be left as a pole upon the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on a hill (30:16).

---

[14] Italics not in the original.

[15] Italics not in the original.

By 701, Sennacherib had put affairs in the east in order, and had advanced to put down the revolts in the west. His chief goal does not seem to have been Judah, and certainly not Jerusalem. Reducing all Phoenicia, except Trye, he sent his main forces down the coast, and dispatched a task force into Judah. Judah was devastated; Jerusalem was blockaded. Hezekiah capitulated, but was permitted to retain his position shut up in Jerusalem. Whatever the reasons, Sennacherib had to return to the east without having completed his work. Enough had been done, though, to keep the west under Assyrian domination for years to come without threat of new revolts.

When Sennacherib's armies first left Phoenicia--then, if not before--the direction of their main drive could be seen. Jerusalem from the first was only an incidental object of attack, not the main objective. Yet, when the country-side was devastated, the outlying cities and districts reduced, and Jerusalem herself was left as a "booth in a vineyard," then, if at no previous time, Isaiah was forced to answer the main question among his disciples. "What is the extent of the Assyrian power; how far are the Assyrian armies going to go?" In part, the answer is given in chapter 10:5-9, 13-14(15). Although Jerusalem will be destroyed at the hands of the Assyrians, the Assyrians are

even now, as always, only instruments in Yahweh's hands. They are the staff of Yahweh's indignation. However far they might go, they will still be confined to limits set by Yahweh. It follows also now as before that, when Yahweh shall have no further need of the Assyrians, the same fate awaits them that awaits all that is lifted up in pride. The end of the Assyrians, however, Isaiah did not declare. He expected them to return and to complete the task of judgment as yet still undone.

At the heighth of the blockade, the people still unrepentant, the prophet begged, still unsuccessfully:

> . . . Why will ye still be stricken, . . .? Your country is desolate; your cities are burned with fire; your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers. And the daughter of Zion is left as a booth in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city. Except Jehovah of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, we should have been like unto Gomorrah (1:5-9).

Continuing, he castigated the people, and looked to the return of the Assyrians which would yet see the dross still left in the city purged away--only the remnant of true believers left over in the end. And after the blockade had been removed, Isaiah looked back upon the crisis, reminding the "dross" that they had trusted in material and physical entities rather than in him who had <u>purposed</u> it long ago. Instead of sackcloth and ashes, there had been mockery and revelry. Therefore, "Surely this iniquity shall not be for-

given you till ye die, saith the Lord, Jehovah of hosts" (22:7-14).

When the revelry was all over, Isaiah retired once again to his disciples. Here in calm reflection, and in explanation of his philosophy of history, which had been developing through the years, he spoke the oracle found in chapter 28:23-28(29). They, the remnant had endured suffering along with the others; it shall not always be thus, though. Moreover, their suffering also had been in the plan of Yahweh, their god. It had been a part of Yahweh's teaching process. And Yahweh "instructs aright."

With this last bit of instruction, the prophet disappears from the scene of history, but his contribution to subsequent ages went, and still goes marching on! His truths, though "twisted by knaves to make traps for fools" in days to come, may still be found embedded in the accumulations of passing years.

V. CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the authentic passages of the book of Isaiah were used to present the prophet's attitudes towards Assyria and Judah, throughout the years of his ministry. His attitudes were found to be consistent, with respect to Assyria, during the whole of his career; and his philosophy of history was pictured as developing with the course of events. Instead of changing in his views, the

prophet was regarded as having narrowed his range of interest from the general to the specific.

He began his career with the announcement of a "Day of Yahweh" upon all that was lifted up in pride and sin. At the same time he conceived of the destruction to come as annihilating most of his own people, and extirpating the remainder. In the course of the development of his ideas he concluded that a remnant would be saved by returning to Yahweh, in the exercise of faith, and thereupon set about to organize this remnant which would be saved when Yahweh's judgment did fall upon his people. Later on he came to regard the Assyrians as the agents of Yahweh selected to effect the judgment. Over against an alliance with Assyria in the Syro-Ephraimitic War, and over against alliances with others to shake off Assyrian suzerainity after a position of vassalage to Assyria had been assumed, he advocated faith in Yahweh as the only proper means of survival. Failing in his public ministry during the years, he confided in his disciples, the true remnant, explaining to them, as time went by, and particularly in 701, his philosophy of history; comforting, and preparing them to be fit subjects of survival when the nation, including Jerusalem, should go down in destruction. The future he left in the hands of Yahweh, without attempting to lift the veil which separated the future from the present.

CHAPTER IV

THE NATURE, STATEMENT, AND EXPOSITION OF ISAIAH'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

To one who looks back over Isaiah's attitudes during the years, certain traits stand out as characterizing the nature of his philosophy of history, and as elements in it. A view of these characteristics and elements enables one to make a statement of, and to present an exposition of the philosophy, based upon its component parts. To these three items: the nature, statement, and exposition of the prophet's philosophy of history, this study now turns.

I. THE NATURE OF ISAIAH'S PHILOSOPHY

Isaiah's philosophy of history is not a definitely formulated and unified something with which he began his career, announcing it, as it were, but something that he stated during the years as the need for an interpretation of Yahweh's relationship to events and the nations became pressing and demanded an answer. It may be assumed, however, that the events of 701 necessitated a more complete statement than ever before, and that, in great part, it is summed up in chapter 10:5-9, 13-14(15). At the same time, it must be realized that the elements in this passage were

present all along, during the prophet's career, after 735-734, and that, more than this one passage is required for a full presentation of his philosophy. Persons living today are able to view his philosophy as a unity not because they stand with him during the critical episodes in his career, but because they look back from 701, removed objectively from it. Three traits serve to characterize the philosophy as it appears from this investigation: A, it is limited in time to the prophet's immediate generation; B, it advances from general to specific considerations during the prophet's career; C, it is limited in its immediate concern to Judah, particularly to the remnant.

A. Isaiah's view of Yahweh in relation to events and the nations is limited to the confines of his own immediate generation. Evidently, he became so concerned with the mutual relationship between the Assyrian armies and Judah --the immediately pressing and real--that it did not come into the province of his ministry to stress the past or to peer into the future.[1] Insofar as this is true, Yahweh's

---

[1] Isaiah's dealing with the future has been discussed in chapter I of this study, under the Messianic oracles. With reference to his dealing with the past of his people, some important statements have been made by: R. B. Y. Scott, The Relevance of the Prophets (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944), p. 141, (see also pp. 149 f.); H. Wheeler Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, p. 127; and by Christopher R. North, The Old Testament

activity in, and relation to, history is limited to a half century of time.

B. Isaiah's philosophy of history advances from general to specific considerations. The prophet began his ministry as many a young messenger of God, with a world-embracing concern, the "Day of Yahweh," and, although his views remained universalistic throughout his career, there occurred a narrowing down of his sphere to immediate interests, due to the pressure of reality in his own narrow homeland, and brought about by the Assyrian crises from 735 through 701. It may be said that he advanced from general to specific interests. Because of the wickedness of the nations, he first conceived of Yahweh as decreeing judgment upon all that was lofty in sin and pride. Such things, be they in nature or among men, would be brought low by destruction until only Yahweh would remain exalted in that "Day." At the same time, however, or shortly thereafter, he gave birth to the idea that a remnant of men would survive

---

Interpretation of History, pp. 42 f.

Says Scott, "Isaiah makes no reference to the tradition [of Israel]; his supreme concern is with the activity of Yahweh in the history of his own time."

Robinson points out that Isaiah "begins the national history with David, and emphasizes the central importance of Jerusalem, the city against which David encamped."

According to North, "Isaiah's references to the past are few, and, apart from the bare mention of Sodom and Gomorrah (Isaiah 1:9f., 3:9), and the phrase 'Who redeemed Abraham' (29:22), which is textually suspect, none recalls the period before Moses."

the catastrophe. This remnant was not to be a universal remnant, but made up of persons in his own land of Judah.

Early in his career, he referred vaguely to the Assyrians as the agents whom Yahweh would employ to execute the judgment which had been decreed. Later, he called these erstwhile, vaguely referred to people by name. Yet, at any time, Assyria was subject to be brought low also by the one who was using her as a tool in his hands. That Isaiah should have announced the doom of Assyria is a natural part of his "Day of Yahweh" concept. The doom of all that was lifted up in sin and pride is stated. He knew all along of Assyria's methods and purposes in war and conquest. He knew all along of the distinction between Assyria's views and Yahweh's views. And from the very first, he did foretell Assyria's destruction, for all along Assyria was bad, not good. From the very beginning, all men and nations were included.

Except, however, for Israel and Judah, Isaiah does not go into details, and he does so particularly, with reference to Judah, because he was a messenger to Judah rather than to the world. The survival of all the nations did not enter his realm of thought; only that of Judah. Even here, however, the survival was to be restricted to the faithfull, who had exalted themselves, like Yahweh, in righteousness.

Yahweh was guiding the course of events; he had a purpose. That purpose was not a purified earth; it was a purified Judah.

C. Isaiah's philosophy of history is limited in its immediate concern to Judah. Whatever link may be established, therefore, between Isaiah and nationalism is not to be seen in any doctrine of the inviolability of Jerusalem-Zion, but in his view of Yahweh's special concern for Judah, and particularly for the remnant, existing through the years. If he had been equally interested in all peoples, he would have been forced either to become a missionary himself, or to send disciples to teach others of Yahweh's ways and to warn them of the impending doom. Yet, nowhere does he seem to manifest such a direct interest in others mentioned in his genuine oracles, except, of course, in the case of Israel.[2]

---

[2] H. H. Rowley, The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), p. 105, makes a statement which is fitting at this point: "The Old Testament is not interested in the history of the world at large, or in the universal process of history. It is interested in the purpose of God for Israel, and it believes that nothing in the process of history can interfere with that purpose."

Still more to the point is an observation made by J. P. Peters, The Religion of the Hebrews, p. 237. In contrasting Amos with Isaiah, he says, "As Amos concerned himself in his prophecies with the nations about Israel as well as with Israel itself, so Isaiah uttered or wrote prophecies about the surrounding nations. Amos seems to place those nations on the same plane with Israel and denounces punishment on all alike for moral evil. Isaiah regards them as tools in

At best, there is a feeling of patriotism within most men. Isaiah was no exception. He was not a man without a country, and never can it be thought that he was one who said, "Judah is not my home; I have no native land."

II. ISAIAH'S PHILOSOPHY STATED

In attempting to put Isaiah's philosophy of history into a single statement, it must be borne in mind that all expressions of it during the course of his ministry have to be welded together. Whereas this is not a simple task, it may be done, with justice to the prophet's views, as follows:

There is a god, Yahweh, whose glory is the fulness of the whole earth. Yahweh is sovereign of the whole earth, and has control of nature and nations in his hands. He has a purpose which consists in destroying all that is sinful and proud, for he is holy in a moral sense. All that is unlike him is destined to go down in destruction on a "Day" decreed by him. At the same time, however, that Yahweh will destroy what is unlike himself, he will preserve in Judah a remnant of men who have turned to him in humility and in the exercise

---

Yahweh's hands to accomplish His purpose concerning His own people. It is not for kidnaping or cruelty or the like that they are to be punished; it is only as a part of Yahweh's plan regarding Israel. He is a practical monotheist, so far at least as Israel is concerned, . . .; and yet he is farther away from a philosophical monotheism than either Amos or Hosea."

of faith. Yahweh uses men and nations, even sinful ones, to effect his purpose, but these evil ones are still under his control. Inasmuch, and insofar as they are evil, they too are doomed to destruction in Yahweh's own time. Yahweh, being spirit, over against human, physical, and material might, is the only object worthy of trust; he alone can save.

III. EXPOSITION OF ISAIAH'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

A. Yahweh, the Hebrew national god, is sovereign of the whole earth. Isaiah, to be sure, did not present something altogether new when he pronounced this doctrine. To a certain extent, he was drawing upon the religious heritage of his people from Moses onwards. Apparently, he was indebted in great measure to Amos who, at least twenty years previously, had proclaimed that not only the Hebrews but other peoples as well came under the sway and even care of Yahweh. Despite any possible indebtedness to Amos, however, Isaiah added a note all his own to the idea of Yahweh's earth-embracing sovereignty. In his inaugural vision, he saw Yahweh whose glory was the fulness of the whole earth: Yahweh is everywhere at one and the same time--in power, and that Yahweh is sovereign over the nations was evident in his use of the Assyrians, the most powerful of the nations, although unknown to them, for the forwarding of his purpose.

All that he needed to do was to whistle, and, from the ends of the earth, they would come in response to his command.

B. Yahweh has a twofold purpose, which includes the destruction of evil and the preservation of good. Following closely upon the heels of his inaugural vision, which revealed not only Yahweh's sovereignty over the whole earth, but his ethical holiness as well, Isaiah saw a fearful "Day of Yahweh" in which all that was unholy, and hence unlike Yahweh, would be destroyed. This destruction would include the realm of nature and man, including Israel and Judah. At first, it seems that the prophet thought that even if a remnant of his own people survived the exterminating judgment, it too would be burned or otherwise destroyed. Later, he came to believe that the remnant would be preserved, due to its reliance upon Yahweh, and its likeness to him, in righteousness. The preservation of this remnant became then as much a part of Yahweh's purpose as the destruction of what was unholy. In contrast to Amos, Isaiah wrote a new chapter in Yahweh's dealing with his people. The title of this new chapter was, "Not destruction alone, but the preservation of the good also, is the end of Yahweh's purpose." The one is the means to the other.

1. Yahweh's holiness in contrast to an evil earth. With respect to the holiness of Yahweh, as with respect to

Yahweh's earth-wide sovereignty, Isaiah was not an innovator. In one sense, Yahweh had always been regarded as holy. His holiness, however, seems to have been associated more with taboo and separateness than with any ethical content. But for Isaiah, Yahweh is exalted in holiness--righteousness--above a sinful--unholy--earth. Human beings may be holy, even as Yahweh is holy; and not being so, due to their own wills, they are to be annihilated. This much was seen in the inaugural vision. It is seen in the cry of the seraphim; it is seen in the dawning consciousness of the prophet that he was an unclean man, living in the midst of an unclean people, and needing purification in order to live. This concept of the prophet is carried over into the "Day of Yahweh" concept in which not only his own unclean people, but the whole world of nature and man will be brought low. The antithesis of holiness, that is, righteous exaltation, is exaltation in sin and pride; and in Yahweh's destruction of what is unholy, all thus exalted will be abased.

2. A remnant to be preserved. Isaiah showed himself to be still further a user of his nation's religious heritage, as well as a possible borrower from Amos, in his doctrine of the remnant. This doctrine, and the concept of "Day of Yahweh" appear to have been part of the eschatological

heritage of the Hebrews of long standing. But just as Amos did in the case of the latter, Isaiah transformed their content into one of ethical significance. In so doing, he shocked his people, but to no avail. He went further with the idea of the remnant than did Amos, due, some feel, to the influence of Hosea's preaching. For Amos, the remnant was to consist of worthless remnants; with Isaiah it is made the sole hope of the future. It will be saved because it, out of the masses of people, will return to Yahweh, and be holy like him. Moreover, it was a continuously present entity down through the years, consisting of the prophet's own disciples.

C. Yahweh is employing the Assyrians to effect his purpose. In his statement that Yahweh is using a particular foreign people, the most powerful on earth at the time, to bring his purpose about, Isaiah advanced beyond Amos again. At first indefinite, he came later to view the Assyrians, specifically, as the agents whom Yahweh was using as a work-tool in his hands. Here, for the first time in the development of Hebrew thought, is such an idea, with regard to a people outside the old domain of Yahweh's sphere of power, set forth. In fact, the Assyrians are so fused with Yahweh's purpose that, at times, their actions are the same as his (29:3; 31:4). Nevertheless, when the Assyrians are no long-

er needed to forward this purpose, the end of all that is unlike Yahweh awaits them.

D. Yahweh is interested in, and controls the events of history. Closely akin to, and even inherent in the idea that Yahweh has a purpose, is the further implication that Yahweh is interested in, and controls the events of history. Yahweh's exaltation in holiness does not remove him from the earth; his glory is at the same time the fulness of the earth. He is in immediate relationship with all that is going on. And, no matter how much to the contrary events may at any time appear, they are still within his control. The Assyrians, though the strongest earthly power, physically and materially, have limits set by Yahweh beyond which they can not pass. Yahweh thus becomes as Christopher R. North says, "Lord of history in which His own people might or might not be directly concerned."[3]

1. Yahweh's concern is limited to his own worshipers. But, although Yahweh's concern, generally, is universal in scope, it is limited, specifically, to his own worshipers. Isaiah, no less than Amos, Hosea, and Micah, believed that Yahweh did not need the Hebrew people in order to survive; but he, like the other Hebrew prophets, regarded Yahweh's interest in other people only in relation to his own. North grasps the significance of this fact when he states, further:

---

[3] C. R. North, op. cit., pp. 72 f.

> It might be expected from the doctrines of the retributive judgement of Yahweh and His universal sovereignty that any special relation He may once have had to Israel would be broken off. Yet this is not so. It is one of the paradoxes of Old Testament religion that Yahweh, who was first worshipped as a national god and then came to be recognized as the God of the whole earth, still continued to be in a particular sense the God of Israel. . . .[4]

Or, as H. Wheeler Robinson puts it, "The broad principle applied was that Yahweh makes use of the nations around Israel to further His purpose within her, . . ."[5]

2. Yahweh's concern is limited to Judah, and the remnant. Furthermore, with Isaiah, Yahweh's concern came to be limited to Judah as over against Israel. It is too much to imply, as does Peters,[6] that Isaiah hopefully expected the fall of Samaria as a prelude to the future blessedness of Judah, in view of the interest given to Samaria in his oracles. But, particularly after the northern kingdom collapsed, all matters for the prophet turned upon Judah. Failing in his efforts to reach the leaders and the people, he saw that the hope of survival lay only with those who had hearkened to his message, and who in the future would continue to hear. In that great "Day," only

---

[4] Ibid., p. 78. Compare this and the following statement with footnote 2, above.

[5] H. W. Robinson, op. cit., p. 128.

[6] J. P. Peters, op. cit., pp. 231 f. E. A. Leslie, The Prophets Tell Their Own Story, pp. 88 ff., takes an opposite view.

these would experience what little preservation there was to be, due to the direct intervention of Yahweh on their behalf.

E. Yahweh alone can save. Finally, Isaiah's philosophy of history stated that, in all the world of physical powers and material might, none of these entities could save. Survival was dependent upon Yahweh alone. In the Syro-Ephraimitic War, he counseled faith as the means to fixity: "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established" (7:9b). In 720, and again in 713-711, he advised against foreign alliances, and going about on this latter occasion garbless to indicate that coalitions were powerless. And in 705-701, when allies were most numerous and strong, when horses and chariots were present in abundance, he proclaimed: "In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and confidence shall be your strength" (30:15b). In contrast to human aid, and physical and material entities, the prophet set Yahweh who is not man, nor flesh, but spirit (31:3).

CHAPTER V

EVALUATION OF ISAIAH'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

In relation to the present day, and from a Christian point of view, Isaiah's philosophy of history has many strong, yet at the same time, weak characteristics. It has been noted already that although a summary statement of his views was uttered most probably in 701, his philosophy of history was present, fundamentally, from the time of his call, and undergoing a process of concentration on the immediate and specific about him in Judah. This being true, both the strong and weak points may be observed during every period of his career.

I. STRONG POINTS

The strong points in Isaiah's philosophy of history are that it: A, gives to Yahweh the preeminent place in the life of the nation, and in the lives of those who may or may not make up the particular nation, Judah,-and advocates reliance upon spiritual and ethical entities for national survival; B, attributes a purpose to history which is sure of realization, for behind that purpose is Yahweh; and C, declares that Yahweh is judging and punishing the wicked Judeans.

A. Isaiah's philosophy of history gives to Yahweh

the preeminent place in the life of the nation, and in the lives of those who either make up the nation or may survive the collapse of the nation. Inasmuch as Yahweh is spirit, it gives to spiritual entities the preeminent place. This characteristic of the prophet's philosophy is seen in his concept of the "Day of Yahweh" when all that was opposed in nature to Yahweh's nature would be destroyed. All nations are included. Insofar as they are not holy, doom awaits them. It is seen again in connection with the actual events of the Syro-Ephraimitic War, when the prophet, over against material fortifications, heathen sacrifice, and reliance upon men as well as fear of them, advocated trust in Yahweh, who is spirit. This trust alone is all that is needful; it alone will avail. "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established." "Try it," he urged king Ahaz, even offering a sign to guarantee its efficacy. If the prophet's advice had been followed, the entangling foreign alliance with Assyria would never have been effected. Reforms would have been made within the nation, and the national policy would have saved all Judah in the same way as only the righteous remnant was considered preserved for survival later on. It is seen still again in the events of 720, 713-711, and 701, especially in the latter two occasions. In 701, Isaiah declared: "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for

help, etc.," and further, "In returning and rest shall ye be saved." And when the siege had been lifted, he saw further devastation to come because, in the crisis, the people had not looked unto the Holy One of Israel. They had continued to rely upon horses and chariots, and upon human aid.

In giving to Yahweh, and hence to the spiritual, first place in the life of the nation, and in the lives of those who may or may not make up the particular nation, Judah, Isaiah advocated humility before Yahweh as a natural corollary of faith. It, humility, was the path to survival, be it national in scope, or concerned with a smaller group. Humility, however, meant more than awe and reverence. It meant, in addition, and to a far greater degree, the exercise of FAITH--humble dependence upon Him who alone could save. Humble dependence, in turn, meant more than merely waiting for Yahweh to intervene in affairs. It meant doing something about evil conditions, or about what, for want of a better word, men call salvation. It meant righteous, ethical conduct on the part of those who would be saved, or who would conform to the requirements necessary for entering the body of the remnant. Regardless of the exercise of some kind of mystical faith evidenced in sacrifices, solemn assemblies, and prayers of a sort (chapter 1:10-15), if the nation would survive, there would have to be what the

prophet incorporates in a very striking passage:

> Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow (1:16-17).

Thus, righteous conduct with Isaiah, was an element of faith. If the nation or men do their part ethically, and trust in Yahweh, Yahweh will preserve them from destruction.

B. Isaiah's philosophy of history attributes a purpose to history, which purpose is sure of realization, because Yahweh stands back of it. This purpose was to exterminate all uncleanness and unholiness; all that was lifted up in pride and unrighteousness. At the same time it was to preserve against destruction all that like Yahweh was exalted in righteousness. And inasmuch as Yahweh is sovereign of the earth, his purpose is certain of fulfilment. The strongest power on earth can not thwart it. It follows naturally that only what is in harmony with Yahweh's purpose will endure.

In the process of fulfilling his purpose, Yahweh was thought of as using an evil instrument, the Assyrian armies. These armies, however, were regarded as acting not on their own but at the bidding of him who had called them hither. And although the prophet did not, in the immediacy and under the pressure of the present problems, picture any final disposition of the evil agents, he did make it known that

they would not go beyond limits set by Yahweh. It follows, that when the work of the agents would be done, these same agents would be disposed of in the same manner as all other wicked things and men. This is the same as saying that, in the long run, evil will be destroyed.

C. Isaiah's philosophy of history declares that Yahweh is punishing the wicked Judeans for their moral and religious impurity. The Judeans were considered by the prophet as having spurned the "Holy One of Israel"; they had violated the laws of conduct which regulated man's relationship with man. In this respect Isaiah walked side by side with Amos. Sin was to be punished not only among others but among the so-called chosen ones as well, even to the destruction of the nation. The covenant relationship was a conditional one. To the extent that Judah broke it, she in turn would be broken. The prophet, therefore, can not be regarded as one who was with his country right or wrong. His criterion was not a nationalistic measuring rod; it was rather the righteousness of Yahweh.

II. LIMITATIONS

The limitations in Isaiah's philosophy of history, though not overwhelmingly numerous in themselves, are made to appear more numerous than they are due to misrepresentations

by persons ever since the prophet's own times. Among such limitations are four noteworthy ones: A, it is limited in outreach as concerns all people; B, it encourages the concept of Yahweh as being merely a national god; C, it is not altogether in harmony with experience; and D, it limits the future to the present world.

A. Isaiah's philosophy of history is limited in its outreach as concerns peoples other than the Hebrews, and ultimately, other than the remnant. Whatever concern Yahweh might have had for the nations was only with respect to his own worshipers. The other nations were left without hope for, not having knowledge of the ways of Yahweh, they were regarded as wicked, and hence doomed to destruction. It was only for a few in Judah who did know and observed Yahweh's requirements that the future belonged.[1]

B. Isaiah's philosophy of history encourages the concept of Yahweh as being merely a national god. Due not to the prophet himself, but to others who interpreted and who still interpret what he said and did, his philosophy of history is made to encourage the concept of Yahweh as being no more than a national god--one who overlooks his people's

---

[1] Fleming James, et al., The Beginnings of our Religion, p. 42, believes otherwise, in the case of Amos and Isaiah. Opposed to his view is that of Albert C. Knudson, The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1918), p. 132.

wrongs, and preserves them right or wrong against their enemies. The fact of this is seen in the legend that grew up around the prophet's relation to the events of 701. It was possible that under the old idea of Yahweh's holiness, which might or might not have attributed inviolability to Jerusalem, the popular religion did feel that Yahweh would protect his earthly dwelling place. One thing is certain, though, Isaiah did not share in the popular belief. But after the city had been spared, contrary to the prophet's expectations, legend attributed to him the prediction that the city would not fall to the Assyrians. With such a starting point, later generations continued the legend. Later still, the legend came to be perpetuated by scholarly acceptance during the years. It is perpetuated today by those who, even though they recognize the inconsistency of oracles of two diametrically opposed kinds coming out of the prophet's mouth at one and the same time--one group contrary to what he had proclaimed for an entire generation--regard both as consistent with his patriotic feeling for his motherland.

1. It numbs the consciousness of national sins. At the same time that misrepresentation reduces Yahweh, in Isaiah's eyes, to a mere national god, it numbs the consciousness of national sins. If Yahweh overlooked a place because it was sacrosanct, the inhabitants of such a place could do

whatever they desired to do, whether it was contrary to Yahweh's demands or not, without punishment as a result of their actions. The one guarantee of security was not right conduct; it was being in the right place at the right time.

2. The future is linked to a particular national entity. Another limitation, imposed by false interpretation, is that Isaiah linked the future with the Judean state. It is clear that the prophet did see the continuation of the true religion in the remnant, even though Judah as a nation should perish, as Israel had done twenty years before. But what he expected the remnant to be as regards a national and political entity is not stated. Those who attribute the doctrine of Jerusalem's inviolability to the prophet, however, naturally presuppose that it is the nation that was to continue--because Isaiah had not reached the plane of thought which could conceive of the religion as existing without the state. Thus, the kingdom of Yahweh (God) is limited to a particular national group.[2]

C. Isaiah's philosophy is not altogether in harmony with experience. A third limitation characteristic of the

---

[2] H. Wheeler Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 197, denies this implication, even though elsewhere he holds to the idea that Isaiah taught the inviolability of Jerusalem. He is able to do so, apparently, because he thinks of Isaiah 1:25-26 as having been directed to the remnant,--as a non-nationalistic entity.

prophet's philosophy of history lies in its not being in harmony with the every day experiences of men and nations.

1. It leaves no place for the use of force in human relations. In this respect, the philosophy, proclaiming as it does that reliance upon Yahweh is all-sufficient,[3] and that it alone is of benefit, raises the question of whether or not the use of physical and material force is at times justified. Experience answers, "Yes." Isaiah, in declaring that force is of no avail, was not a pacifist, if Fleming James may be relied upon for accuracy in his analysis of prophetic religion. Speaking of the prophets in general, and yet including Isaiah, he says:

> . . . To them war was not in itself wrong, but only where it interfered with Yahweh's will. And yet we can notice in them a change of feeling towards war, in contrast to the attitude of Moses, Samuel and Elijah. Personally they were men of peace. Though they welcomed the invasion of Assyrian and Chaldean as Yahweh's punishment of a guilty people, they did nothing to bring it on. With all their threatenings of divine visitation, they lifted no finger against those whom they denounced.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> No, these prophets were not pacifists, but they seem to have been on the way to pacifism. One cannot but feel that if they understood our modern world they would point away from war to trust in God. Our battleships, military planes, tanks and guns would seem to them a denial of faith in a Higher Power that rules the world.[4]

---

[3] This would be denied, of course, by those who claim that at the heighth of the siege of Jerusalem, Isaiah encouraged Hezekiah to resistance of the Assyrians.

[4] Fleming James, et al., The Beginnings Of our Religion, pp. 51 f.

2. It encourages a passive trust in Yahweh. At the same time that Isaiah's philosophy of history leaves no place for the use of physical and material force in an evil world, it lends encouragement, from one point of view, to a passive trust in Yahweh, which may or may not be fatalism.[5] On the one hand, man was to do nothing but wait for the intervention of Yahweh who, in his own time, would heal a bad state of affairs, to the benefit of those who trusted in him. Human action was thus either minimized or excluded altogether.

3. It gives rise to a misleading kind of religious security. Here again is seen a limitation in Isaiah's philosophy of history as it pertains to human experience. It implies that Yahweh intervenes on behalf of the righteous, preserving them from disaster. It implies, still further, that only the evil perish during judgment. Moreover, it implies that if one does survive he is righteous, and vice versa. That such is not true in human experience is everywhere evident.

4. It implies that evil always comes to a more or less speedy end. Contrary to the opinion of one Old Testa-

---

[5] For two opposing views on this subject see Henry J. Cadbury, National Ideals in the Old Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), pp. 123 f., and H. Wheeler Robinson, op. cit., p. 191.

ment scholar,[6] Isaiah's philosophy of history does imply that evil forces, men, and nature come, sooner or later, to an appointed end. This is evident in his proclamation that all that was unlike Yahweh was doomed to destruction. And for Isaiah, that destruction lay in the immediate future.

D. Isaiah's philosophy of history limits the kingdom of Yahweh (God) to the earth. A fourth general limitation of the prophet's philosophy of history, if not from the present day point of view, then surely from a Christian one, is that it stops with the present order of things, and limits the new era to the earth. No hope exists, for the prophet, beyond the present sphere of human activity. There is no intimation of a greater super-mundane life which lies beyond present experience, either as a continuation of the earthly life or as something different and new. H. Wheeler Robinson makes this point quite clear when, in contrasting the kingdom of God in the Old and New Testament he writes:

> . . .But the new order of life contemplated in the Old Testament is to be realized wholly on the earth and in the immediate future. It is itself the final stage, and there is no sense of contrast with some heavenly life which will follow it.[7]

---

[6] H. H. Rowley, The Rediscovery of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), pp. 104 f.

[7] H. Wheeler Robinson, op. cit., p. 194.

III. ABIDING VALUES

When the strong points of Isaiah's philosophy of history are set over against the limitations, there are certain abiding values which stand out as valid for all times, and as possessing a message for the present age. What Rowley says of all the great prophets in general is applicable to Isaiah in particular:

> But while every prophet was primarily the mouthpiece of God to his own generation, and related his message to the affairs of his own day, there was always a timeless element in the message of the great prophets. They were not mere political and social reformers, but men who penetrated some of the secrets of God's heart, and laid them bare for all succeeding generations. They did not see the whole of God's heart, indeed, and none of them had a perfect view of Him. But each of them enshrined some fresh understanding of God in a new emphasis in divine truth. And what is equally vital is that the distinctive message of each prophet is always based on his own experience, and is always intimately related to his view of God.[8]

In Isaiah are to be seen the following: A, the preeminence of the spiritual in contrast to the physical and material is an eternal truth; B, the proper course to survival is God-wards; C, a stabilizing message of hope, comfort, and security is found in the prophet's philosophy of history; and D, the religion of Jesus is approximated in some respects.

---

[8] H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of the Bible (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944), pp. 68 f.

A. The preeminence of the spiritual is an eternal truth. In setting God, the spiritual, above physical and material entities, Isaiah gave to every age an eternal truth. God is ever above the things of nature and of man. He can not be reduced to these, but ever stands apart. Moreover, God is given first place in all considerations. Nothing is done apart from his desires and his will. Such an attitude recognizes that the spiritual alone is strong, and that it alone endures. This being true, only the spiritual affords a worthy center of permanent trust and confidence. On the other hand, material and physical entities, no matter how strong they may appear for the moment, can not be relied upon. At best they are only temporary; they change and decay.

B. The proper course to survival is God-wards. Whether one thinks in terms of the international, national, or individual, Isaiah's philosophy of history points out the proper course to survival, salvation, or whatever term one wishes to choose. That proper course is not towards men or machines; it is in the direction of God, the present "Holy One of Israel." Only by following such a course, in deed as well as in word, can the solution to the problems of war and peace be found; only thus can a nation continue to survive; only thus can the individual find abundant and

eternal life.

Isaiah's philosophy is a call not only to put God first, but to trust him, for he alone is strong, forever. To our day it cries, "Away with your confidence in atomic bombs and power politics; away with imperialistic greed and exploitation; away with nationalistic and racial monopolies on God, for he belongs to no one, he is God of all!"

The failure of our present world to heed this call carries one back to 701. The policy of even the so-called Christian nations is not that of Isaiah. It is rather the policy of Hezekiah who continued to trust in Egypt, and in horses and chariots because they were many. The same fate, therefore, awaits the present world which, even yet, refuses to look to God.

C. A stabilizing message of hope, comfort, and security is found in the prophet's philosophy of history. As is true with religion and life generally, Isaiah's philosophy of history presents an inconsistency, and a paradox, in its message to the world of today; and what appears as a limitation is discovered to be a strong point also. No less today than in the prophet's times, the message of hope, comfort, and security is limited to a few,[9] although many may lay claim to it.

---

[9] Cf. H. W. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 196 ff.

1. A message of hope lies in Isaiah's philosophy of history. It is found in the same center wherein it lay when the prophet gave to his first-born son the name Shear-jashub, a remnant shall return. The return of the remnant today, as in the prophet's day, is an already present reality, living and bearing witness to a righteous God who is active in history. The earth is never so filled with evil that a remnant does not stand out from the masses, on the side of right and God. There is further hope, also, in the thought that the remnant of the present is never the remnant in its ultimate totality. Continuing through the years, it will grow until the kingdom of the world will at last become the kingdom of God. Another aspect of the message of hope, closely akin to the thought of an increasing remnant, lies in the words of the prophet, "In returning and rest shall ye be saved." Here, "returning" means repentance and the acceptance of God's will. There is hope for the world, if it repents and turns to God; if it cleans its house of evil and meets the requirements of God.

2. A message of comfort is contained in Isaiah's philosophy of history. It states that although evil may be regnant in the world, there is a limit beyond which it can not go, because there is a God who not only controls history but who has a purpose towards which history is moving. The world belongs to God; it is in his hands. Comfort lies in

ones trust and confidence in God who is the lord of history. "Fear not [therefore]; neither let thy heart be faint." The message of comfort lies also in the prophet's words, "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength," where comfort means "strong with." To him, who amid weakness remains quiet in confidence in God, comfort is given. He is strong, with God.

3. A message of security is found in Isaiah's philosophy of history. As in the case of the message of hope, and the message of comfort, so here also security rests upon trust in God, as opposed to other entities which are not spirit. With trust in the abiding and eternal spiritual entity of the universe, one may remain secure, even though the world of nature and of man be removed. Again, security lies in not fearing nor being faint of heart, for one with God is always the majority. That one shall put, with God, ten thousand to flight.

D. The religion of Jesus is approximated in some respects. With due allowance made for its lower degree of insight into God's real universality and concern for all men, and for its limitation of God's kingdom to the earth, Isaiah's philosophy of history approximates in some respects the religion of Jesus. It declares that evil, though in the ascendancy for the moment, can not go beyond the control of God. It states that God preserves at least those who return

to him in righteousness. It states that God has a purpose which is sure of realization, and which is one of preservation rather than destruction. It points out also that righteousness will win out over evil, if not in the short, then in the long run of existence. And, finally, it leads in the direction of serving God not for material benefits, but for its own sake alone.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this dissertation was to: 1, discover the philosophy of history of Isaiah ben Amoz, the author of chapters 1-39, in the main, in the book of Isaiah; 2, relate the prophet's philosophy of history to the times in which he lived; 3, relate the prophet's philosophy of history to the present day. Towards the accomplishment of this threefold task, chapter I was devoted to the first aim; chapters II, III, and IV to the second; and chapter V to the third.

Proceeding upon the thesis that Isaiah's philosophy of history is to be seen most clearly in his attitudes towards Assyria in relationship with Judah, particularly; if not also in the Messianic oracles which depend upon the Assyrian-Judean relationship, chapter I made a critical study of the anti-Assyrian, anti-Judean, and Messianic oracles, in order to discover the prophet's true attitudes, and the true sources for his philosophy of history. In the course of this critical investigation, it was discovered that only the anti-Judean oracles, and one anti-Assyrian

oracle are genuine, and as a consequence, that the prophet's attitudes remained the same down through the years.

The anti-Assyrian oracles were regarded as ungenuine for five reasons: 1, the ideas contained in them are opposed to the ideas in the universally accepted anti-Judean oracles; 2, they are out of harmony with their contexts; 3, the universalism contained in them is too exalted for the eighth century B. C.; 4, their language and style, as well as their historical background, are later than the time of Isaiah ben Amoz; 5, the reasons advanced by scholars to show them to be genuine are untenable.

The one accepted anti-Assyrian oracle was shown to present a theory of the Assyrian conquests rather than a pronouncement of doom upon the Assyrian armies. Even so, it was addressed as a word of explanation to the prophet's disciples, instead of as a word of comfort to the Judean populace.

The Messianic oracles were declared ungenuine for three main reasons: 1, they depend upon the spurious anti-Assyrian oracles; 2, they contain a nationalistic spirit which was not characteristic of Isaiah ben Amoz; 3, they picture a future time with which the prophet was not concerned.

In order to relate the prophet to the times in which

he lived, chapter II presented the history of the prophet's times; chapter III related the prophet to the history; while chapter IV, in the light of the preceding chapters, presented the nature, statement, and exposition of the prophet's philosophy of history.

Chapter II gave an account of the initial contacts between Assyria and the Hebrew kingdoms; conditions in Israel and Judah in the first half of the eighth century; the submission of Israel and Judah to Assyria, resulting in the destruction of Israel in 720, and the continued position of vassalage for Judah despite attempts at various times to throw off the Assyrian yoke, the last such attempt occuring in 705-701. In this last attempt, Hezekiah's reforms were shown to have been made in 705 as a political gesture of independence. It was shown, further, that despite the legend of a remarkable deliverance of Jerusalem in 701, Judah was ravaged, Hezekiah submitted to Sennacherib; and that Sennacherib was victorious in that year.

Depending upon the findings in chapter I, and upon the history of the times in which the prophet lived, presented in chapter II, chapter III related the prophet to his times. It was shown that he was consistent in his attitudes throughout the whole of his career. He expected a "Day of Yahweh" on which everything that was opposed

to Yahweh's nature would be abased. A remnant of Judeans, however, were conceived of as preserved against the judgment when it should come. The judgment, which had been decreed by Yahweh, was to be effected by the Assyrian armies which, inasmuch as they were evil, would be destroyed when they had served Yahweh's purpose. The doom of the Assyrians, however, and a future glorious state for the remnant, subsequent to the destruction of the Assyrians, the prophet did not declare. Chapter III showed, further, that instead of a change there was a development in the prophet's views. From concerning himself at first with matters of an earth-wide nature, he turned to concentration upon the immediately real and present problems of his homeland.

Chapter IV, upon the basis of the preceding chapters, presented a discussion of the nature of the prophet's philosophy of history as a separate and distinct entity; and gave an exposition of the philosophy of history in terms of the prophet's thought.

Chapter V related the prophet's philosophy of history to the present day. In doing so, it presented a discussion of strong points, limitations, and abiding values. The strong points were listed as follows: 1, it gives to Yahweh the preeminent place in the life of the nation; 2, it attributes a purpose to history; 3, it de-

clares that Yahweh is punishing the wicked among his own people. The limitations were regarded as being: 1, it is limited in outreach as concerns other peoples; 2, it encourages the concept of Yahweh's being a national god; 3, it is not altogether in harmony with human experience; 4, it limits the kingdom of Yahweh to the earth. Four abiding values were discerned: 1, it raises the spiritual to the preeminent place in life; 2, it points God-wards as the course towards survival; 3, it presents a message of hope, comfort, and security; 4, it approximates in some respects, the religion of Jesus.

II. STATEMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS

This dissertation has made four contributions to the study of the prophet Isaiah ben Amoz and his book, with respect to the prophet's own times and to the present day.

First, it has isolated the sources upon the basis of which Isaiah's true philosophy of history must be reconstructed. In performing this task, it has shown that the prophet's views did not include the final overthrow of the Assyrian armies, specifically and in detail, apart from everything else in nature and among men; nor the picturization of a Messianic age, thought of as following in the wake of the destruction of the Assyrians. On the other

hand, it has shown that the prophet's philosophy of history concerned itself increasingly with the Judeans, and ultimately with the remnant which consisted of the prophet's own disciples, in the prophet's own immediate generation.

Second, this study has related the prophet to his times. It has presented him as a preacher of doom upon his people, at the hands of Yahweh's appointed agents, the Assyrian armies, to the end of his career; and as an advocate of faith in Yahweh, interpreted as righteousness in human conduct and humble dependence upon Yahweh, as the one true course towards survival.

Third, this study has presented Isaiah's philosophy of history in a thorough-going manner, such as has not been done previously.

Fourth, this study has related Isaiah's philosophy of history to the present day. It has stated that when, from a present day and Christian point of view, the strong points of his philosophy of history are compared with its limitations, certain abiding values remain, of benefit to all times, if they are heeded. In performing this service, this study has made available to preachers, teachers, and other religious leaders of the Christian faith materials that may be of great use to them in their ministry.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DISSERTATION

A. B. C. - Abingdon Bible Commentary.

A. J. S. L. L. - American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.

B. Z. Z. F. A. W. - Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

J. B. L. - Journal of Biblical Literature.

"Viewpoints" - "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hopes for the Future."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. COMMENTARIES ON THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

Box, G. H., The Book of Isaiah. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909. 365 pp.

Delitzsch, Franz, Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. 2 vols. Translated from the Fourth Edition, by J. Martin. (Clark's Foreign Theological Library, New Series, Vol. XLII.) Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890. 458 pp.

Duhm, D. Bernh., Das Buch Jesaia übersetzt und erklärt (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, herausgegeben von D. W. Nowack.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892. 458 pp.

Gray, George Buchanan, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah. Vol. I, I-XXVII. (The International Critical Commentary.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912. 472 pp.

Kissane, Edward J., The Book of Isaiah. Vol. I, (I-XXXIX.) Dublin: Browne and Nolan Limited. The Richview Press, 1941, 425 pp.

Marti, D. Karl, Das Buch Jesaja Erklärt. (Kurzer H. G. Zum A. Testament, Band III.) Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900. 428 pp.

McFadyen, John Edgar, The Book of the Prophecies of Isaiah. (The Bible for Home and School, S. Mathews, general editor.) New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910. 423 pp.

Mitchell, Hinckley G., Isaiah, A Study of Chapters I-XII. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Company, 1897. 263 pp.

Skinner, J., The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, Chapters I-XXXIX. Revised edition. (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, A. F. Kirpatrick, general editor for the Old Testament.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915. 314 pp.

Wade, G. W., The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. Second edition, revised. (Westminster Commentaries, Edited by Walter Lock and D. C. Simpson.) London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1929. 431 pp.

Whitehouse, Owen C., Isaiah I-XXXIX. (The New Century Bible, Walter F. Adeney, general editor.) Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, n. d. 381 pp.

B. BOOKS ON THE PROPHET ISAIAH AND HIS BOOK

Boutflower, Charles, The Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX in the Light of the Assyrian Monuments. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1930. 364 pp.

Cheyne, Thomas Kelly, Introduction to the Book of Isaiah. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1895. 448 pp.

Driver, S. R., Isaiah: His Life and Times and the Writings Which Bear His Name. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, n. d. 214 pp.

Ewald, H., The Prophet Isaiah Chapters I-XXXIII. Translated from the German, by O. Glover, Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1869. 176 pp.

Giesebrecht, Friedrich, Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik Nebst einer Studie uber Prophetische Schriftstellerei. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verlag, 1890. 220 pp.

Glazebrook, M. G., Studies in the Book of Isaiah. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1910. 349 pp.

Gordon, Alex. R., The Faith of Isaiah Statesman and Evangelist. London: James Clarke & Co., 1919. 260 pp.

Hackmann, H., Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1893. 174 pp.

Kellner, Maximilian Lindsay, The Prophecies of Isaiah An Outline Study of Isaiah's Writings in Their Chronological Order in Connection with the Contemporary Assyrio-Babylonian Records. Cambridge (Mass.): Press of Graves & Henry, 1895. 36 pp.

Kennett, Robert H., The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology. (The Schweich Lectures, 1909.) London: Oxford University Press, 1910. 94 pp.

Meinhold, J., Die Jesajaerzählungen Jesaja 36-39 Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1898. 104 pp.

Wilke, Fritz, Jesaja und Assur Eine exegetisch-historische Untersuchung zur Politik des Propheten Jesaja. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Theodor Weicher), 1905. 128 pp.

C. PUBLICATIONS ON THE PROPHET ISAIAH AND HIS BOOK

Beer, Georg, "Zur Zukunftserwartung Jesajas," Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXVII (1914), 13-35.

Dittmann, Herbert, "Der heihge Rest im Alten Testament," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, (Siebenundachtzigster Jahrgang (1914), 603-618.

Fullerton, Kemper, "The Problem of Isaiah, Chapter 10," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Reprint, XXXIV (April, 1918), 170-184.

_____, "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hopes for the Future," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLI (1922), 1-101.

_____, "Isaiah's Attitude in the Sennacherib Campaign," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, XLII (October, 1925), 1-25.

_____, "Isaiah 14:28-32," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Reprint, XLII (January, 1926), 86-109.

Mitchell, Hinckley G., "Isaiah on the Fate of His People and Their Capital," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXVII (1918), 149-162.

Smith, J. M. P., "Isaiah and the Future," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, XL (July, 1924), 252-258.

Smith, Louise Pettibone, "The Messianic Ideal of Isaiah," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXVI (1917), 158-212.

D. WORKS ON HEBREW PROPHECY AND PROPHETS

Buttenwieser, Moses, The Prophets of Israel from the Eighth to the Fifth Century Their Faith and Their Message. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914. 350 pp.

Cornill, Carl Heinrich, Der israelitische Prophetismus. Achte bis zehnte auflage. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl Trübner, 1912. 183 pp.

Driver, S. R., The Ideals of the Prophets. Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1915. 239 pp.

Faus, W. Arthur, The Genius of the Prophets. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press: New York, 1946. 190 pp.

Kent, Charles Foster, The Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets from the Beginning of the Assyrian Period to the End of the Maccabean Struggle. (The Student's Old Testament.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910. 516 pp.

Leslie, Elmer A., The Prophets Tell Their Own Story. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1939. 307 pp.

Robinson, Theodore H., Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel. London: Duckworth, 1923. 22 pp.

Scott, R. B. Y., The Relevance of the Prophets. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944. 237 pp.

Smith, W. Robertson, The Prophets of Israel and Their Place in History to the Close of the Eighth Century B. C. Second edition; London (1895): A. & C. Black, Ltd., 1928. 446 pp.

E. BOOKS ON HEBREW RELIGION

Barton, George A., The Religion of Israel. (Religious Science and Literature Series, Edited by E. Hershey Sneath.) New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918. 289 pp.

Budde, Karl, Religion of Israel to the Exile. (American Lectures on the History of Religions, Fourth Series--1898-1899.) New York: G. P. Purnam's Sons, 1899. 228 pp.

Knudson, Albert C., The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1918. 416 pp.

Leslie, Elmer A., Old Testament Religion in the Light of Its Canaanite Background. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1936. 289 pp.

Lods, Adolphe, La Religion D'Israël. (Histoire des Religions.) [Paris?]: Librarie Hachette, 1939. 256 pp.

Oesterley, W. O. E., and Theodore H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion Its Origin and Development. Second, revised and enlarged edition; London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1937, 448 pp.

Peters, John Punnett, The Religion of the Hebrews. (Handbooks on the History of Religion, Vol. V, Edited by Morris Jastrow.) Boston: Ginn and Company, 1914. 502 pp.

Robinson, H. Wheeler, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. (Studies in Theology.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913. 245 pp.

F. BOOKS ON OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE

Bewer, Julius A., The Literature of the Old Testament. Second edition. (Records of Civilization Sources and Studies, No. V, Edited under the auspices of the Department of History, Columbia University, Austin P. Evans, general editor.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1933. 464 pp.

Driver, S. R., An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. New edition, revised 1913. (International Theological Library, No. I, Edited by Charles A. Briggs and Stewart D. F. Salmond.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914. 577 pp.

Oesterley, W. O. E., and Theodore H. Robinson, An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. 454 pp.

Pfeiffer, Robert H., Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941. 917 pp.

G. WORKS ON HEBREW AND RELATED HISTORY

Goodspeed, George Stephen, A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians. (The Historical Series for Bible Students, Vol. VI, Edited by Charles F. Kent and Frank K. Sanders.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. 422 pp.

Honor, Leo L., Sennacherib's Invasion of Palestine A Critical Source Study. (Contributions to Oriental History and Philology, No. 12.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1926. 122 pp.

Leslie, Elmer A., "The Chronology of the Old Testament," (The Abingdon Bible Commentary, Edited by Frederick Carl Eiselen, et al.) New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1929. pp. 108-113.

McCurdy, James Frederick, History, Prophecy and the Monuments or Israel and the Nations. Three vols. in one. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911. 469 pp.

Mould, Elmer W. K., Essentials of Bible History. (Religious Series, Luther A. Weigle, general editor.) New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1939. 678 pp.

Paton, Lewis Bayles, The Early History of Syria and Palestine. (The Semitic Series, No. VIII, Edited by James Alexander Craig.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901. 302 pp.

Renan, Ernest, History of the People of Israel. 5 vols., 1894-1895, Vol. III, Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1894. 429 pp.

Robinson, Theodore H., and W. O. E. Oesterley, A History of Israel. 2 vols.; Vol. I, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932. 497 pp.

Robinson, T. H., The Decline and Fall of the Hebrew Kingdoms. (The Clarendon Bible, Edited by Herbert Newcastle, et al.) Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1926. 246 pp.

Wellhausen, Julius, Prolegomena to the History of Israel. Translated from the German, by J. Sunderland Black, and Allan Menzies. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1885. 552 pp.

H. MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT

Cadbury, Henry Joel, National Ideals in the Old Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920. 269 pp.

James, Fleming, Personalities of the Old Testament. (The Hale Lectures, 1938.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939. 632 pp.

North, Christopher Richard, The Old Testament Interpretation of History. (Fernley-Hartley Lecture, 1946.) London: The Epworth Press, 1946. 210 pp.

Robinson, H. Wheeler, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946. 298 pp.

Rowley, H. H., The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946. 314 pp.

I. GENERAL WORKS

Baldwin, Edward Chauncey, Our Modern Debt to Israel. Boston: Sherman, French & Company, 1913. 219 pp.

Barclay, George, The Bible Speaks to Our Day. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1945. 93 pp.

Binns, R. Elliott, The Jewish People and Their Faith. (The Christian Religion Its Origin and Progress, Part I, J. F. Bethune-Baker, general editor.) New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. 125 pp.

James, Fleming, et al., The Beginnings of Our Religion. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. 170 pp.

Rowley, H. H., The Relevance of the Bible. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944. 192 pp.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

The Abstract of a Dissertation

ISAIAH'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

by
Charles Buchanan Copher

(A. B., Clark College, Atlanta, 1938; B. D., Gammon Theological Seminary, 1939; B. D., Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, 1941)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

1947

For many years in some circles of biblical scholars, it has been customary to speak of Isaiah ben Amoz, the author of the book of Isaiah, chapters 1-39, in the main, as having set forth either the beginnings of, or a complete philosophy of history. Insofar as the present investigator is aware, no one has made a thorough-going study of the prophet's philosophy of history: only brief statements have been made about it, or, what statements have been made have been based upon a few, chiefly spurious, texts in the book of Isaiah.

Defining "philosophy of history" as the prophet's interpretation of the relationship between Yahweh, the Hebrew national god, and between Yahweh and the nations, this dissertation purposed to discover what the prophet's philosophy of history was, relate it to the prophet's own times, and to relate it to the present day.

The study proceeded upon the thesis that Isaiah's philosophy of history is to be seen most clearly in his attitudes towards Assyria in relationship with Judah; and possibly in some of the Messianic oracles, which are dependent upon the relationship between Assyria and Judah. The biblical sources used in the study were, then, the so-called Assyrian oracles in the first thirty-nine chapters of the book of Isaiah, and in II Kings, chapter 19, in

which two different attitudes are shown towards both Assyria and Judah; and four Messianic passages which are still regarded as Isaiah's by many scholars.

In order to discover which of the different attitudes represented the true spirit of the prophet, and hence his philosophy of history, an investigation was made of the opinions of several biblical scholars. This investigation revealed that the anti-Judean oracles are universally accepted as genuine; that the arguments against the authenticity of the anti-Assyrian oracles, except one, and against the authenticity of the Messianic oracles, are far more tenable than the arguments in favor of their genuineness.

The arguments against the authenticity of the anti-Assyrian oracles are: 1, the ideas contained in them are opposed to the ideas contained in the universally accepted anti-Judean oracles; 2, they are out of harmony with their context; 3, the universalism contained in them is too exalted for the eighth century B. C.; 4, their language and style, as well as their historical background, are later than the time of Isaiah ben Amoz; 5, the reasons advanced for a change in the prophet's attitude towards the Assyrian armies, and towards his people, are wholly subjective and unreasonable.

The arguments against the Messianic oracles are: 1, they depend upon the ungenuine anti-Assyrian oracles; 2, they contain a nationalistic spirit which was not characteristic of Isaiah ben Amoz; 3, they picture a future time with which the prophet was not concerned, since he was interested in the immediately real and present problems of his own generation.

The investigation revealed, still further, the sources within the book of Isaiah that must be used in reconstructing the prophet's philosophy of history. These sources are the anti-Judean oracles; and one anti-Assyrian oracle, which presents a theory of the Assyrian conquests rather than a picture of the overthrow of the Assyrian armies. Moreover, the views of the prophet being consistent throughout his career, particularly after 735, the genuine oracles are applicable to any and all periods of his life.

Upon the basis of the authentic sources, the prophet was related to the times in which he lived. He began his career by pronouncing doom, the "Day of Yahweh," upon the whole world of man and nature, including his own people, because the whole world was opposed to Yahweh's holy nature by sin and pride. A short while later, he conceived of a remnant of his people as preserved against doom because they would repent and exercise faith in

Yahweh, becoming, thus, like Yahweh in nature. He thereupon set about to develop the remnant, his own immediate disciples. The prophet, referring at first vaguely to them, but later calling them specifically by name, regarded the Assyrian armies as the agents of the doom decreed by Yahweh. This message he proclaimed consistently, particularly after 735, to the end of his career. Over against reliance upon alliances, superstitious practices, and cultic rites, he advocated faith in Yahweh as the only true course towards survival for the nation and individual men within the nation, Judah. Faith, the prophet conceived of as humble dependence upon Yahweh, who was considered spirit in contrast to men, animals, and implements of war; and as ethical conduct in human relations.

In the place of a change in the prophet's attitudes towards Assyria and Judah, this study presented the prophet as developing in his views from concern with earth-wide matters to matters of immediate concern for Judah, and ultimately, of immediate concern for only the remnant which consisted of his disciples. Inasmuch as these alone exercised faith, they alone would survive the destruction that awaited at the hands of the Assyrian armies. This destruction of the masses of the Judean people the prophet continued to expect even after the blockade of Jerusalem had been lifted due to the return of Sennacherib to Assyria.

The destruction of the Assyrian armies, however, the prophet did not describe, except insofar as he had described, early in his career, the destruction of everything opposed in its nature to Yahweh. And, since the Assyrian armies were never thought of as being anything other than unlike Yahweh, they were included in the doom announced by the prophet in his "Day of Yahweh" concept.

In light of the findings thus far, it is possible to view the general nature of the prophet's philosophy of history, and to state it. The nature of his philosophy is to be seen in the following characteristics: 1, it is confined to the prophet's own immediate generation; 2, it advances from general, and earth-wide considerations to specific considerations of immediate and pressing events in Judah; 3, it is limited in its immediate concern to Judah, the prophet's native land, and ultimately to the remnant.

Put into a brief statement, the prophet's philosophy of history is as follows: There is a god, Yahweh, whose glory is the fulness of the whole earth. Yahweh is sovereign of the whole earth; he has the control of nature and the nations in his hands. He has a purpose which consists in destroying all that is sinful and proud, for he is holy and exalted in righteousness. All that is unlike him is destined to be abased on a "Day" decreed by Yahweh. At the

same time, however, that Yahweh purposes to abase what is not like himself, he will preserve a remnant of men out of the masses of Judah who have turned to him in humility and in the exercise of faith. Yahweh uses men and nations, even sinful ones, to effect his purposes, but these evil ones are still within his control He has set limits beyond which they can not go. Inasmuch, and insofar as the agents whom he uses are evil, they too are doomed to destrudtion in Yahweh's own time. Yahweh, being spirit, over against human, physical, and material might, is the only entity worthy of trust; he alone can save.

In relation to the present day, and particularly from a Christian point of view, Isaiah's philosophy of history contains some noteworthy strong points, but also several limitations as well. The strong points are that: 1, it gives to Yahweh, who is spirit, the preeminent place in the life of the nation, and in the lives of those who make up the nation or who may survive the collapse of the nation; 2, it attributes a purpose to history, which purpose is sure of realization because Yahweh stands back of it; 3, it declares that Yahweh is punishing his own people for their religious and moral impurity. The limitations are that: 1, it is limited in outreach as concerns peoples other than the Hebrews; 2, it encourages the concept of Yahweh's being merely a national god; 3, it is not al-

together in harmony with human experience; 4, it limits the kingdom of Yahweh (God) to the earth.

Despite the fact that there are limitations in Isaiah's philosophy of history, there are some abiding values in it which are valid for all time. These abiding values are: 1, it raises the spiritual to the preeminent place in life; 2, it points out that the proper course towards survival is God-wards; 3, it presents a stabilizing message of hope, comfort, and security; 4, it approximates, in some respect, the religion of Jesus.

Charles Buchanan Copher was born March 3, 1913, in Troy, Missouri, to Henry and Tabitha Copher. He spent the first fourteen years of his life in Troy, where he received his grammar school training. In 1927, he entered Sumner High School, St. Louis, Missouri. Four years later, he graduated from high school, as an honor student. After receiving one year of college training in St. Louis, and after working for two years, he entered Clark College, and Gammon Theological Seminary, of Atlanta, Georgia, where he pursued college and seminary studies concurrently. He received the A. B. degree from Clark College in 1938; the B. D. degree from Gammon Theological Seminary in 1939.

Upon graduation from Gammon, Mr. Copher was united in marriage with Miss Marie White, a classmate; and the couple were assigned to Oberlin, Ohio, as their first pastoral charge. Mr. Copher remained in Oberlin for two years, during which time he continued his education in the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology. In 1941, he was granted a B. D. degree by Oberlin College.

In the fall of 1942, Mr. Copher was assigned to Fourth Methodist Church, Boston, Massachusetts, where he is still the pastor. Since 1944, he has been pursuing studies towards the Ph. D. degree under Dr. Elmer A. Leslie, in the Graduate School of Boston University.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02551 0282